

COUNTY OF SAN MATEO
Planning and Building Department

Initial Study Pursuant to CEQA
Project Narrative and Answers to Questions for the Negative Declaration
File Number: PLN 2006-00360
Cowell Purisima Coastal Trail Project

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The California State Coastal Conservancy (SCC) proposes to construct a 3-mile segment of the California Coastal Trail beginning at the existing Cowell Coastal Access and extending southward as a coastal bluff-top trail through the North Cowell Ranch and Purisima Farms property, ultimately reaching the north boundary of the South Cowell Ranch property. The trail terminates at a new parking/staging area near Cabrillo Highway 1. The trail will be a pedestrian and bicycle trail that will be located back from the coastal bluff within a 25-foot wide existing recreation easement on the North Cowell Ranch and a 50-foot wide recreation easement on the Purisima Farms property. A small portion of additional easement area approximately 0.2 acres is proposed to accommodate the proposed trail corridor. Additional existing trail easement area is not proposed to be utilized.

Project features include an 8-foot wide base rock and/or decomposed granite trail (with 1-foot wide compacted shoulders), three prefabricated bridges (to cross two ravines and Purisima Creek), and a small (17-car capacity) parking/staging area. The project also includes erosion control features, drainage improvements, smooth wire fencing to separate the trail from agricultural fields, and access gates to allow closure of the trail when necessary. Sections of the trail at Purisima Creek will traverse slopes of up to 40%, which will be accomplished by using a standard recreational trail cross section with switchbacks to meet California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) standards for American Disability Act (ADA) access.

The Cowell Purisima Coastal Trail will be a multi-use trail serving recreational users and is proposed to be sited to keep the trail set back from the edge of the bluffs due to the sensitivity of an adjacent seal colony, the danger presented by the cliffs, to protect the native coastal scrub and riparian habitats and to discourage people from trying to reach the beach from the trail. One formal overlook is proposed at the south end of the trail to provide additional coastal views.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The Cowell-Purisima Trail project is located in the southern coastal portion of San Mateo County, south of Half Moon Bay, as depicted on Figure 1 (regional map) and contains two primary properties: the North Cowell Ranch and the Purisima Farms. The northern portion of the project is accessed from the existing parking/staging area and trailhead at Cowell Coastal Access/Cowell Ranch State Beach, as depicted on Figure 2 (project area map). The project area continues southward for approximately 3 miles as a coastal bluff-top trail through North Cowell Ranch property, ending at the southern end of the Purisima Farms property. The trail then turns

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

File No. PLN 2006-00360

Page 2

eastward, terminating at a new parking/staging area near Highway 1. The project is located in the unincorporated area of San Mateo County.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

1. LAND SUITABILITY AND GEOLOGY

- a. Will (or could) this project involve a unique landform or biological area, such as beaches, sand dunes, marshes, tidelands, or San Francisco Bay?**

Yes, Significant Unless Mitigated. The coastal bluff within the project area ranges in height from 90-130 feet, fronted by a narrow beach. Most of these bluffs are subjected to wave impacts and coast erosion during high tides or periods of high surf. The rate of historic sea cliff retreat is estimated at 0-4 inches per year. This rate is expected to be the same in the future, except for possible seismic shaking resulting in additional retreat of possibly 20 feet. The proposed trail will be located a minimum of 10 feet from the edge of the coastal cliff/bluff (a unique landform); however, the majority of the trail will be set back considerably more from the bluff, and in several areas will be set back 50 feet or more. The submitted Geotechnical Report concludes, for the most part, the trail is not expected to be significantly impacted by bluff erosion. If erosion does undermine the trail at some future time, the trail can be easily relocated inboard and away from the bluff edge. All hardened structures (i.e., bridges and culverts) are located well away from the edge of the bluff and the risk from bluff erosion at these sites is negligible. Improvements from the trail and bridges will result in a slight increase in runoff that may impact the integrity of the local sea cliffs. However, through implementation of a series of erosion control measures which disperses runoff and requires that bare areas are revegetated, the potential for future erosion of the sea cliff as a result of the proposed project may be mitigated to a level of insignificance.

Mitigation Measure 1: All project structures shall meet the requirements and recommendations of the Uniform Building Code, Structural Engineers Association of California, the County Geologist, and the soil and foundation investigation report submitted for the project site. Assumptions and design parameters are subject to approval by the County Geologist.

Mitigation Measure 2: Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit to the Planning Department for review and approval an erosion and drainage control plan which demonstrates how the trail and bridge approaches will be graded and controlled, and the transport and discharge of soil and pollutants from the project site will be minimized, consistent with the recommendations as outlined in the submitted "Engineering Geological Review Proposed Cowell Ranch/Purisima Farms Coastal Trail (Timothy C. Best, CEAG, 2004)." This plan shall also include a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which shall adhere to the San Mateo

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

File No. PLN 2006-00360

Page 3

Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program “General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines.” The goal of this plan is to prevent sediment and other pollutants from leaving the project site and to protect all exposed earth surfaces from erosive forces including:

- a. Stabilizing all denuded areas and maintaining erosion control measures continuously between October 15 and April 15.
- b. Removing spoils promptly, and avoiding stockpiling of fill materials when rain is forecast. If rain threatens, stockpiled soils and other materials shall be covered with a tarp or other waterproof material.
- c. Storing, handling, and disposing of construction materials and wastes so as to avoid their entry to a local storm drain system or water body.
- d. Avoiding cleaning, fueling or maintaining vehicles on-site, except in an area designated to contain and treat runoff.
- e. When cleaning sediments from streets, driveways and paved areas on construction sites, the applicant shall use dry sweeping methods where possible. If water must be used to flush pavement, collect runoff to settle out sediments and protect any storm drain inlets.
- f. Storm drain inlets shall be protected from sediment-laden runoff to the greatest extent feasible. Storm drain inlet protection devices include sand bag barriers, filter fabric fences, block and gravel filters, and burlap bags filled with drain rock.
- g. Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.
- h. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.
- i. Stockpiles and excavated soils shall be covered with secured tarps or plastic sheeting.

The approved erosion and drainage control plan shall be implemented prior to the commencement of construction.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

File No. PLN 2006-00360

Page 4

b. Will (or could) this project involve construction on slope of 15% or greater?

Yes, Significant Unless Mitigated. The trail approaches to the bridge over Purisima Creek are located on slopes greater than 15%. Measures included in the plan specify the trail within the Purisima Creek canyon shall be sloped to direct runoff to dissipation areas, and/or diversion berms should be built to direct runoff to dissipation areas. Construction details are included in the submitted Engineering Geologic Review to address areas of the trail construction which is to occur on slopes less than 60% such as construction on a partial bench, as well as if trail construction is to occur on slopes greater than 60%, such as construction on a full bench with spoils end hauled to suitable locations. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 1 above will minimize any construction impacts on slopes greater than 15% to less than significant.

c. Will (or could) this project be located in an area of soil instability (subsidence, landslide, or severe erosion)?

Yes, Significant Unless Mitigated. Shallow landsliding, deep seated landsliding and stream bank erosion were documented along the steep ravines in the project area, with most landslides occurring on slopes over 70%. The soils in the area are predominantly a sandy loam that is moderately well drained. It is prone to erosion where water is concentrated and/or where perched groundwater emerges from the coastal face and ravine sidewalls. The project area contains localized gullying where these conditions occur. The submitted geotechnical report outlined construction specifications that the bridge foundations be designed as drilled piers into specified depths to reach bedrock or to depths designed to withstand an active soil pressure to account for potential shallow landsliding. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 1 and 2 above will minimize any construction impacts related to landslide activity to less than significant.

d. Will (or could) this project be located on, or adjacent to a known earthquake fault?

Yes, Significant Unless Mitigated. The project is located within one mile of the San Gregorio Fault and the site would be subject to strong ground motion in a moderate to large earthquake on this and the nearby San Andreas Fault. The site is not located within the State-designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Significant seismic shaking can damage bridge foundations and cause localized failures along the steep coastal bluffs and ravines. Trails would need to be rerouted if failures occur. Due to the undeveloped condition of the area and recreational nature of the project, seismic activity is not expected to be a significant impact to trail users. The project would not substantially increase land use intensification within the project site. The proposed project does not increase the exposure of people to these events since they already exist. All development associated with individual projects would be required to comply with construction standards and seismic design criteria adopted by the

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

File No. PLN 2006-00360

Page 5

County of San Mateo and contained within the Uniform Building Code. Implementation of these standard engineering and construction techniques, as outlined in Mitigation Measure 1, would minimize the risk of hazards from seismic events to a level of insignificance.

e. Will (or could) this project involve Class I or Class II Agriculture Soils and Class III Soils rated good or very good for artichokes or Brussels sprouts?

Yes, Not Significant. Per the County's Agricultural Land Use Maps which are based of the U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Land Use Compatibility Classifications, the project area does include Prime Agricultural Land which consists of Class I or Class II Agriculture Soils, as well as Class III Soils rated good or very good for artichokes or Brussels sprouts. Further, the project area does include Prime Soils according to the San Mateo County Planned Agricultural District (PAD) Ordinance, as the site would meet two of the other five definitions for classification of Prime Agricultural Land which pertain to the value of its agricultural production. The subject properties of North Cowell and Purisima Farms (which contain land both east and west of Highway 1) total approximately 1,221 acres. The trail corridor and parking/staging area proposed as part of this project are located within the portion of these parcels strictly west of Highway 1. Combined, the North Cowell and Purisima Farms properties contain a total of approximately 410 acres of agricultural land (land that is currently or has previously been farmed) within the portions of the respective parcels west of Highway 1 which is where the project proposed is located. The approximate area of prime agricultural soils to be utilized for the proposed project is 10 acres (approximately 4.26 acres of the North Cowell property and 6.34 acres of the Purisima Farms property). It follows that the project proposes to utilize less than 1% of the agricultural land within the subject parcels. However, additional agricultural land that otherwise may have been impacted is not proposed to be utilized as part of the project. Specifically, a total of 3.81 acres of existing easement areas within agricultural land is either proposed to be abandoned (1.79 acres within Farm Center area) or to not be used to accommodate the trail corridor (2.02 acres in North Cowell).

In combination with the ability of these remaining agricultural lands to continue to substantially meet the subsequent definition of Prime Agricultural Land, it is determined that the involvement of Prime Agricultural Land as a result of the proposed project is less than significant. Further, public recreation trails within prime soils are a conditionally permitted use in the Planned Agriculture District (PAD).

f. Will (or could) this project cause erosion or siltation?

Yes, Significant Unless Mitigated. The project (trails and bridges) will involve disturbance of approximately 5.91 acres, of which 4.56 acres would be disturbed for trail construction (the proposed trail is approximately 3 miles in length, with a 12-foot

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

File No. PLN 2006-00360

Page 6

wide disturbance area). An additional 1.35 acres would be disturbed for the proposed parking/staging area. If proper measures are not taken to stabilize and protect disturbed soils during the grading and construction phases and/or if rain occurs during these operations or before groundcover is implemented, then the potential for erosion or siltation exists. The applicant will be responsible for implementing the erosion control measures as required by Mitigation Measure 2 to avoid erosion and siltation. As all proposed improvements described are to be finished with a permeable material, encouraging on-site groundwater absorption, significant long-term erosion or siltation impacts would not occur.

g. Will (or could) this project result in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land?

Yes, Not Significant. Please see response to Item 1.e above. The project has been designed in the attempt to minimize direct and indirect impacts on agricultural land by using bridges to span ravines, rather than routing the trail around the ravines adjacent to more fields and farm roads through existing trail easements. By doing such, however, this design attempt does propose to amend the existing easements in a few locations which would result in the addition of 0.2 acres of impacted agricultural land. Specifically, toward the north end of the North Cowell property, the width of the trail corridor is proposed to be increased 10 feet, from 25 feet to 35 feet for a distance of approximately 500 feet. This is in response to a request from the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service to help protect a harbor seal colony from disturbance by trail users. The additional setback will allow the colony to be screened from the trail. Secondly, at Purisima Creek, an additional 12.5-foot wide trail easement is proposed to be added to connect from the Recreational Property to the proposed bridge crossings of Purisima Creek. The original easement document planned for the trail to connect east along the north bank of the creek to a public parking area near Highway 1. This would have had an undesirable proximity to the farm operations center and residences.

Adding the easement and creek crossing allows the California Coastal Conservancy to abandon 1.79 acres of existing public access and parking easements within the Farm Center area located on the North Cowell to avoid impacts on this operation. Further, approximately 2.02 acres of agricultural land within existing trail easements are not proposed to be utilized under the proposed project. Thus, while a total of approximately 10 acres of agricultural land is proposed to be impacted as result of the project, an additional approximate 3.8 acres of agricultural land that may have otherwise been impacted will be unaffected. In total, less than 1% of the overall existing agricultural land is impacted by the proposed project.

As discussed in Response 3.d and Mitigation Measure 9, below, measures are incorporated in the project to reduce potential conflicts between trail users and agricultural use of the adjacent land including agricultural spraying.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

File No. PLN 2006-00360

Page 7

j. Will (or could) this project affect a natural drainage channel or streambed, or watercourse?

Yes, Not Significant. The project proposes three prefabricated bridges to span two ravines and Purisima Creek. All components of the bridges (i.e., pier drilled foundations and the bridge structures) will be placed outside the natural drainages and watercourses, such that no significant impacts will occur to these resources. The bridge will be placed using a crane parked on the bluff top such that no equipment will access the creek bed. The trail will cross small intermittent drainages at Ravine 1 and Ravine 6 through the installation of culverts. A streambed alteration permit will be required from the California Department of Fish and Game, as well as approvals from the Regional Water Quality Control Board for the proposed bridge and culvert construction. Installation of the trail crossing at Ravine 6 will require removal or pruning of a few native willow trees. The proposed location and siting of the new parking/staging area at the South Cowell Ranch was designed in consultation with the Department of Fish and Game, establishing a minimum 25-foot buffer zone from an existing drainage channel. A 5.11-acre reservoir is located on the South Cowell Ranch property, approximately 800 feet south of the proposed trail and drains into a separate drainage trail that is located south of the proposed trail project.

Within the project area, freshwater marsh vegetation was documented around the perimeter of the manmade impoundments (farm ponds). This vegetation is dominated by wetland plant species and would meet the definition of a wetland as defined by Local Coastal Program. Further, the submitted biologic report noted a small area downslope of one farm pond (mapped as riparian grassland) as an area supporting rushes typical of wet areas, which may be considered a wetland. A small portion of the trail (approximately 75 feet which comes nearest to these wetland, or freshwater marsh vegetation) maintains an approximate 75-foot distance from the outermost edge of this defined wetland area. However, as the proposed trail would primarily be located on the existing farm road, that areas of this existing farm road which are not proposed to be used for trail corridor would remain and that the trail corridor would be separated by a fence, no significant impacts to the adjacent wetlands are anticipated from trail use.

Therefore, no significant impacts will result to any natural drainage channel, streambed or watercourse as a result of this project.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

File No. PLN 2006-00360

Page 8

2. VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE

- a. Will (or could) this project affect Federal or State listed rare or endangered species of plant life in the project area?**

Yes, Significant Unless Mitigated. The submitted biologic assessment concludes that no Federal or State listed rare or endangered plant species were identified in the project area and that the project area would provide limited potential habitat for these special status species due to the ruderal condition of much of the site, previous agricultural activities and lack of suitable habitat. One locally unique plant species was observed within the coastal scrub and portions of the coastal terrace prairie in the project study area: beach strawberry. This species was observed growing amid other scrub plant species. This species has no State or Federal status, nor is it listed as rare by CNPS. The species is, however, considered locally unique in the County's Local Coastal Program. Implementation of the following mitigation measure will lessen any impact to the beach strawberry to less than significant:

Mitigation Measure 3: To avoid impacts to occurrences of beach strawberry, the project biologist shall identify occurrences of beach strawberry within 10 feet of construction and the applicant shall design trail improvements to avoid impacts to these areas. Temporary protective fencing shall be installed adjacent to occurrences of beach strawberry prior to trail construction, with the protective fencing maintained until trail work is completed.

- c. Will (or could) this project be adjacent to or include a habitat food source, water source, nesting place or breeding place for a Federal or State listed rare or endangered wildlife species?**

Yes, Significant Unless Mitigated. The biological report observed potential habitat for the California red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake, two federally listed species, within the project area, although the report does not confirm direct observation of any California red-legged frogs or San Francisco garter snakes on-site. No significant impacts are anticipated for these species if the wetland areas are avoided and trail construction is scheduled during the driest time of the year (between August 1 and October 15). Mitigation measures are identified to ensure the project avoids and/or minimizes impacts to these species.

Mitigation Measure 4: Trail construction should be scheduled during the driest time of year. For trail areas near wetlands, creeks or ravines construction shall be limited to between August 1 and October 15. This would minimize any potential harm to the California red-legged frog and the San Francisco garter snake, if they are present in the project vicinity, because during the dry late summer these species are usually found at sites with permanent water. Prior to construction of the bridge across Purisima Creek and the trail areas within 300 feet of the agricultural ponds, a

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

File No. PLN 2006-00360

Page 9

qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys for California red-legged frogs and San Francisco garter snakes. If these species are observed, the applicant shall consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) prior to proceeding with work. The applicant shall implement all avoidance measures as recommended by the USFWS.

d. Will (or could) this project significantly affect fish, wildlife, reptiles, or plant life?

Yes, Significant Unless Mitigated. A pelagic cormorant/pigeon guillemot-nesting colony was also observed in the vicinity of the trail route. Although these species are not listed as special status species, their nests are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. The proposed trail terminates approximately 1,200 feet north of the pelagic cormorant/pigeon guillemot-nesting colony. Due to this distance, no impacts to these species are expected from trail construction or use. Monarch butterflies may over-winter in a eucalyptus grove at Purisima Creek. Due to the distance between the trail and the grove, no impacts to this species are likely from trail construction or use. However, timing construction outside of the pelagic cormorant/pigeon guillemot-nesting period and the Monarchs over-wintering would mitigate any potential impacts of these species to less than significant.

Toward the north end of the North Cowell property, the width of the trail corridor is proposed to be increased 10 feet, from 25 feet to 35 feet for a distance of approximately 500 feet. This is in response to a request from the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service to help protect a harbor seal colony from disturbance by trail users. The additional setback will allow the colony to be screened from the trail. A portion of the proposed trail just south of the existing Cowell Beach access area passes above an area of beach and rocky shelves designated as a sensitive area for harbor seals. The area is deemed sensitive because harbor seals haul out of the water to rest, especially during the pupping season. The proposed trail is not expected to impact this area as the trail is located well above the beach/rock area, the width of trail corridor is proposed to be increased 10 feet (from 25 feet to 35 feet) for a distance of approximately 500 feet in response from a request from the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service and no additional beach access is proposed for this area. This harbor seal haul-out site is already visible from the existing Cowell Beach access trail and educational signs are located along the trail. As part of the proposal, the applicant is proposing to plant native vegetation within this area to screen these existing views of the seal (beneficial impact).

The project will temporarily disturb existing plants and habitat that occur on the site. Approximately 1,200 sq. ft. of riparian woodland vegetation will be trimmed/removed for placement of two prefabricated bridges (i.e., over Purisima Creek and Ravines 2, 4/5, and the culvert crossing at Ravine 6). Trail construction will also occur within an area of coastal terrace prairie, a sensitive habitat, and coastal scrub.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

File No. PLN 2006-00360

Page 10

With the exception of the riparian, prairie and coastal scrub habitats, most of the trail will occur within areas comprised of non-native, weedy plant species. Only one plant species considered locally unique under the County LCP, beach strawberry, was observed in the project area. This species was observed within the coastal scrub and portions of the coastal terrace prairie (please see Mitigation Measure 3 above).

No long-term impacts to special status species are expected from the use of the proposed trail, as it would not remove any vital habitat for these species. Successful implementation of the following mitigation measures, in combination with Mitigation Measures 3 and 4 outlined above, will reduce impacts to wildlife and plant life to a level of less than significant:

Mitigation Measure 5: All construction shall be scheduled to occur after the end of the usual nesting season for breeding birds and the autumnal gather place or overwintering for Monarch butterflies. Construction shall occur after July 31 and before April 15 of any given year.

Mitigation Measure 6: To minimize impacts to riparian woodland, coastal terrace prairie and coastal scrub, the project biologist shall identify where these habitats occur within the trail alignment or where they occur within 10 feet of construction. The applicant shall design trail improvements to minimize tree removal within the riparian woodland and select trail alignments within the prairie and scrub that minimize the removal of native vegetation within these habitat types. Temporary, protective fencing shall be installed along the edge of the trail construction area to minimize the footprint of construction, with the protective fencing maintained until trail work is completed. The applicant shall implement erosion control measures following trail construction to avoid deposition of sediment into habitats. At bridge crossings, the applicant shall minimize the removal/limbing of riparian vegetation to the greatest extent feasible during placement of the prefabricated bridges and allow trimmed vegetation to naturally re-grow. Post-construction erosion control seeding shall use native grasses and forbs.

Mitigation Measure 7: To minimize degradation of marine habitats, including harbor seal haul-out areas, implement best management practices for erosion control (see Mitigation Measure 1). Toward the north end of the North Cowell property, above the seal haul-out area the width of the trail corridor shall be increased 10 feet, from 25 feet to 35 feet for a distance of approximately 500 feet.

f. Will (or could) this project infringe on any sensitive habitats?

Yes, Significant Unless Mitigated. Please refer to the discussion in 1.f, 2.a, c-d and the required Mitigation Measures 1 through 6. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 1-6 will ensure that impacts to sensitive habitats are less than significant.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

File No. PLN 2006-00360

Page 11

- g. Will (or could) this project involve clearing land that is 5,000 sq. ft. or greater (1,000 sq. ft. within the County Scenic Corridor), that has slopes greater than 20% or that is in a sensitive habitat or buffer zone?**

Yes, Significant Unless Mitigated. Please refer to the discussion in 1.b, 2.a, c-d; implementation of Mitigation Measures 3-7 will ensure that impacts to sensitive habitats and associated buffers and associated impacts from construction on slopes greater than 20% are less than significant. With the exception of the new parking/staging at the southern end of the project boundaries, the proposed trail corridor will not be visible from the Cabrillo Highway/Highway 1 (a scenic corridor). The new parking/staging area is located adjacent to the existing farm road which is proposed to remain as part of this application. Further, as stated by the applicant, comments received by the Department of Fish and Game state that this existing farm road may continue to be used in its existing capacity. With the exception of one vault toilet, no other structures are proposed to be constructed. The parking area would be almost entirely screened by a landscaped berm between the parking and Highway 1, while avoiding any significant impacts to ocean views. Both parking stalls and the remainder of the parking area and pathways connecting the parking to the public facilities are to be surfaced with compacted base rock which provides a rustic appearance consistent with the natural setting.

3. PHYSICAL RESOURCES

- b. Will (or could) this project involve grading in excess of 150 cubic yards?**

Yes, Significant Unless Mitigated. Construction of the trail, bridges, parking/staging area, gully head repair and other project features will involve grading/disturbance of approximately 5.91 acres. The total amount of cut and fill is approximately 4,742 cubic yards. Of this amount, approximately 2,692 cubic yards will be cut and approximately 2,049 cubic yards will be fill. Temporary air quality impacts may result from the grading activities, such as dust or odors on and around the site. Additionally, these impacts are temporary during grading and construction activities only. Fine particulate matter (PM) is the pollutant of greatest concern with respect to grading and construction activities, but these emissions would be less than significant due to the minimum amount of activity proposed and the temporary duration of time. Mitigation Measure 1 requires construction compliance with the recommendations as outlined in the submitted Geological Report, while Mitigation Measure 2 requires submittal of a drainage and erosion control plan to prevent erosion and to stabilize areas disturbed after construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 8, in combination with implementation of Mitigation Measures 1 and 2 as discussed, would reduce potential impacts on erosion and water quality due to grading and construction activities to a less than significant level.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

File No. PLN 2006-00360

Page 12

Mitigation Measure 8: The applicant shall submit a dust control plan to the Planning Department for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit associated with any phase of this proposed project. The plan shall include the following control measures:

- a. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily.
- b. Water or cover stockpiles of debris, soil, sand or other materials that can be blown by the wind.
- c. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two (2) feet of freeboard.
- d. Apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking and staging areas at construction sites. Also, hydroseed or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas.
- e. Sweep daily (preferably with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking and staging areas at construction sites.
- f. Sweep adjacent public streets daily (preferably with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto them.
- g. Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).
- h. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads within the project parcel to 15 mph.

The approved plan shall be implemented for the duration of any grading and construction activities that generate dust and other airborne particles.

- c. **Will (or could) this project involve lands currently protected under the Williamson Act (agricultural preserve) or an Open Space Easement?**

Yes, Not Significant. The proposed trail and parking/staging area are proposed on conservation and/or public recreation easement lands that are held by Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST) and the American Land Conservancy (ALC) (as a grantee for State Coastal Conservancy). There are no open space easements designated on the lands. The North Cowell parcel (APN 066-170-070) is currently protected under the Williamson Act; however, no existing contract was documented. The proposed project will not affect this designation.

- d. **Will (or could) this project affect any existing or potential agricultural uses?**

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

File No. PLN 2006-00360

Page 13

Yes, Significant Unless Mitigated. The proposed trail corridor is located primarily within existing trail/recreation easements contained within each of the subject parcels. The proposed trail improvements will impact approximately 4.2 acres of existing agricultural land. However, the trail corridor was designed to include three ravine bridges, as opposed to continuing within the boundaries of the existing trail/recreation easements in the attempt at minimizing impacts to over 2 acres of agricultural land.

Implementation of the project and recreational use of the trail may affect existing agricultural uses if trail use precludes normal agricultural operations on the adjacent agricultural lands (i.e., pesticide application or other agricultural operations). The plan, however, includes measures to ensure that recreational uses do not impede continued agricultural operations on the properties. Such measures include posting permanent signs at the parking/staging area and at other appropriate locations along the trail that inform trail users of the adjacent agricultural operations. Signs will warn users that pesticides may be used on the properties, users may get wet from agricultural irrigation, and there will be periodic closures to accommodate specific agricultural operations and that trespassing onto surrounding lands is prohibited. The plan also specifies that there will be an agreement between the applicant (or managing entity of the trail), property owners of the surrounding agricultural lands and a Farm Bureau representative, which will specify when and how trails will be closed to allow for pesticide applications and other agricultural operations. Further, this agreement will allow for term revisions should future agricultural conditions potentially change.

Locking trail gates with signs notifying the public that the trail is closed to accommodate agricultural operations will also be installed for use by the agricultural operator and/or operator to close the trail, consistent with the agreement. Similarly, at two locations along the fencing which runs east/west from the proposed parking/staging area to the bluff top trail within the Purisima Farms property, double boundary fence gates will be included which will allow livestock and equipment to cross the trail. These gates open inward towards the proposed trail corridor and will allow livestock a passageway to access land on the southern side of the trail corridor. The inward opening design of the gates also prohibits livestock from accessing the trail corridor. This east/west segment of the trail corridor would otherwise prevent livestock from accessing their primary drinking water source, which is located at an existing reservoir south of the trail. In addition to the double boundary fence gates, a water pump shall be installed to distribute water through a new or existing underground pipe from the reservoir under the trail corridor to its north side at a terminus which will allow livestock water access.

In consultation with the agricultural operators, the trail will also be separated from the agricultural areas by 5-foot high fence, constructed of weave/hog wire with two strands of barbed wire added to the top, and Peeler Core posts installed at intervals to

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

File No. PLN 2006-00360

Page 14

serve as reinforcement for the other installed T-bar posts to minimize trail/agricultural use conflicts. Dogs are not allowed on the trail corridor.

Mitigation Measure 9: The applicant, or operating entity of trail, shall post signs at the parking areas and at other appropriate locations along the trail corridor that inform facility users of the adjacent agricultural operations. Signs will warn users that agricultural chemicals may be used on the properties, users may get wet from agricultural irrigation, there will be periodic closures to accommodate specific agricultural operations and that no trespassing onto surrounding lands is permitted. Parking may be prohibited at potentially affected parking areas during periods of pesticide application, if needed. The applicant shall be responsible for posting any parking prohibitions or closure. The applicant, or operating entity of trail, shall enter into an agreement with the owners of the surrounding agricultural lands who may request Farm Bureau representation. The terms of the agreement will specify when and how the parking areas and trail will be closed to allow for pesticide applications and other agricultural operations and that the agreement has the ability to be revised to address potential future changes to agricultural conditions. The applicant shall submit a copy of this written agreement, to include all terms as outlined, to the Planning Department prior to finalizing of any associated permit by the Building Inspection Section. The separating fence at the parking/staging area and at other appropriate locations along the trail corridor shall be constructed of weave/hog wire with two strands of barbed wire added to the top, including Peeler Core posts installed at intervals to serve as reinforcement for the other installed T-bar posts to prevent entrance to the adjacent agricultural fields or Highway 1. A water pump shall be installed to distribute water through a new or existing underground pipe from the existing reservoir located on the South Cowell Ranch property under the trail corridor to its north side at a terminus which allows livestock water access.

4. AIR QUALITY, WATER QUALITY, SONIC

The project site is located within the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), which is the primary agency responsible for comprehensive air pollution control in the entire San Francisco Bay Area. The BAAQMD develops and enforces air quality regulations for non-vehicular sources, issues permits and operates a regional air quality-monitoring network. In addition, the Federal Clean Air Act and the California Clean Air Act mandate the control and reduction of certain air pollutants. Projects with operational emissions that exceed 80 pounds per day of reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NOx) or fine particulate matter (PM10) are considered to cause a significant air quality impact (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, 1999). Vehicle-related emissions from the project (i.e., construction vehicles and visitors utilizing the trails) are not expected to approach these thresholds as project traffic would be substantially less than 2,000 vehicles per day (the criterion used by the BAAQMD to determine whether a detailed air quality analysis is required). The level of service at nearby intersections is not anticipated to decline, and project traffic would not increase

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

File No. PLN 2006-00360

Page 15

traffic volumes on nearby roadways by 10% or more; therefore, carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations are not expected to change substantially (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, 1999).

- d. Will (or could) this project involve the application, use or disposal of potentially hazardous materials, including pesticides, herbicides, other toxic substances, or radioactive material?**

Yes, Significant Unless Mitigated. Small amounts of hazardous materials (oil, gasoline, etc.) may be temporarily located on-site during the new project construction activities. This routine occurrence would be subject to existing local, State, and Federal regulations and controls, and thus would not be expected to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. The operation and use of the proposed project would not involve the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, other than small quantities of hazardous materials, such as paints, cleaners, and disinfectants, normally used in routine maintenance and cleaning functions. These commercial products are labeled to inform users of potential risks and to instruct them in appropriate handling and disposal procedures. Most of the materials are consumed through use, resulting in relatively little waste. For these reasons, hazardous materials use by the project would not pose any substantial public health or safety hazards related to hazardous materials. The adjacent agricultural operations store pesticides and other chemicals within their barns and other facilities, which are not located in close proximity to the proposed project. As discussed in Response 3.d, above, agricultural chemicals applied to the adjacent agricultural field could adversely affect users of the trail and improvements. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 9 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level which requires measures to post and temporarily close the trail prior to and after pesticide applications.

- f. Will (or could) this project generate noise levels in excess of levels determined appropriate according to the County Noise Ordinance standard?**

Yes, Significant Unless Mitigated. The proposed project would not generate substantial long-term noise impacts following the completion of construction given the nature of the land use. Construction activities would generate noise through the use of mechanized equipment, which would temporarily generate noise at the site during the construction period. Sensitive receptors are defined as any place or living thing whose comfort, health, or well-being may be impaired by pollution. Sensitive receptors may include schools, residences, churches, hospitals and other public spaces. The sensitive receptors in the project area consist of the residences along Purisima Creek Road, Marsh Produce Stand, and the Cowell Coastal/Beach access, which are located approximately 1,000 feet from the trail or parking/staging area. These nearby noise-sensitive land uses could be disturbed by project construction noise during the construction period. Construction noise would occur in phases that

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

File No. PLN 2006-00360

Page 16

would include excavation and grading of the parking sites, erection of the new restroom building, and paving and finishing. Construction equipment used for these types of construction activities generates maximum noise levels ranging from 80-89 dBA at a distance of 50 feet from the equipment. At a distance of 100 feet from the construction site, typical hourly average construction noise levels during busy construction periods are 75 dBA to 80 dBA. Such noise levels typically drop off at a rate of about 6 dBA per doubling of distance.

Based on these factors, construction period noise levels at the project site could at times exceed existing ambient levels, as well as the interior and exterior noise levels set forth in the San Mateo County Code. These noise effects represent a potentially significant impact during the construction period. Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce construction noise impact to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure 10: The applicant and construction contractor(s) shall comply with the following noise abatement measures during project construction:

- a. Contractors shall comply with all relevant provisions of applicable noise policies and ordinances, including Title 4, Chapter 4.88 (Noise Control of the San Mateo County Ordinance Code).
- b. Noise levels produced by construction activities shall not exceed 80-dBA level at any one moment. Construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Monday through Friday, and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays. Construction activities shall be prohibited on Sunday and any national holiday.
- c. “Quieter” models of equipment (such as gas or electric equipment as opposed to diesel-powered equipment) shall be used where technology exists or all construction equipment shall have sound-control devices no less effective than those provided on the original equipment. No equipment shall have unmuffled exhaust.
- d. Loud equipment shall not be staged within 200 feet of noise-sensitive receptors to the greatest extent feasible.
- e. The applicant shall designate a “noise disturbance coordinator” who is responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The noise disturbance coordinator shall determine the source of noise complaints (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and institute reasonable measures to correct the problem. A telephone number for the noise disturbance coordinator and approved construction hours shall be posted at the site on

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

File No. PLN 2006-00360

Page 17

conspicuous signage. The noise disturbance coordinator shall contact and advise adjacent noise-sensitive receptors of the construction schedule.

- f. The use of loud sound signals shall be avoided in favor of light warnings except those required by safety laws for the protection of personnel.
 - g. Following the commencement of construction and as directed by the County of San Mateo, the contractor shall implement appropriate noise mitigation measures including, but not limited to, changing the location of stationary construction equipment, shutting-off idling equipment, rescheduling construction activity, notifying adjacent residents in advance of construction work, rerouting heavy truck traffic, or installing acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources or construction sites.
- g. Will (or could) this project generate polluted or increased surface water runoff or affect groundwater resources?**

Yes, Significant Unless Mitigated. Surface water through the project area includes sheet flow from the surrounding agricultural lands, flow within intermittent drainages and smaller gullies, surface runoff from Highway 1, and agricultural ponds. Winter runoff travels through the fields, onto existing farm roads, ultimately entering the drainages or sheet flowing over the coastal bluff. With the exception of the intermittent drainages and agricultural ponds, water resources on the site are limited to precipitation. Precipitation occurs primarily between November and April, with normal annual rainfall approximately 25-30 inches. The project site is not subject to flooding. Following implementation of the trail project, surface runoff from the improvements will be designed to cause minimal disruption to natural drainage patterns. Rolling dips, knicks, or ditch relief culverts will be installed to adequately drain the trail, as delineated in the submitted Engineering Geologic Review. Erosion within existing gullies will be rock armored and revegetated to prevent future erosion. A detailed Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which will outline the construction-related measures for this project is required as part of Mitigation Measure 2 above. The parking/staging area along Highway 1 will have a base rock surface, so as to not create impervious surfaces. The vault toilet, concrete apron to the parking staging area and three prefabricated bridges will collectively contribute approximately 3,450 sq. ft. of impervious surface to the project area. The trail and parking/staging area are to be finished with a pervious material to allow for on-site stormwater absorption. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 2, as outlined above, will reduce any surface water runoff impacts to less than significant.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

File No. PLN 2006-00360

Page 18

5. TRANSPORTATION

- b. Will (or could) this project cause noticeable increase in pedestrian traffic or a change in pedestrian patterns?**

Yes, Not Significant. The proposed trail is introducing a new activity to the area by creating pedestrian and bicycle access to the coastal bluff. Due to the relatively short distance of the trail, limited parking capacity and limited recreational opportunities (i.e., lack of beach access and loop trails), a substantial significant increase in pedestrian traffic is not expected to be significant.

- c. Will (or could) this project result in noticeable changes in vehicular traffic patterns or volumes (including bicycles)?**

Yes, Not Significant. Please see response to 5.b above. Operating characteristics of signalized and un-signalized intersections are described by the concept of Level of Service (LOS). LOS is a qualitative description of an intersection's performance based on the average delay per vehicle. Intersection level of service ranges from LOS A, which indicates free flow or excellent conditions with short delays, to LOS F, which indicates congested or overloaded conditions with extremely long delays. The San Mateo County Congestion Management Program significance criteria for intersection service levels define LOS A through D as acceptable, while a deficient level of service at an intersection is defined as LOS E or LOS F. Although intersection service level criteria are usually related to signalized intersections, they can be used as a reference when analyzing un-signalized intersections.

The proposed trail is the type of recreational land use that attracts people throughout the day and week. As such, it does not generate heavy peak hour traffic that affects roadway or intersection operations. Further, due to the limited capacity of the proposed new parking area (17 spaces) a substantial increase in traffic is not anticipated. It would take hundreds of additional visitors during a peak hour to change the intersection level of service at the new intersection along Highway 1. CalTrans has reviewed the conceptual parking staging area proposal and determined no improvements to Highway 1 would be required to accommodate the new parking area. In conclusion, the proposed public access improvement is not anticipated to add additional traffic, or to substantially change travel patterns.

- d. Will (or could) this project involve the use of off-road vehicles of any kind (such as trail bikes)?**

Yes, Not Significant. The proposed trail would serve multi-users, both pedestrian and bicycles. No motorized off-road vehicles would be allowed, with the exception of the park rangers and possibly vehicles associated with adjacent agricultural uses on an as needed basis. Due to the limited parking capacity proposed, anticipated number

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

File No. PLN 2006-00360

Page 19

of trail users and proposed compacted base rock trail finish, impacts from trail bikes would be less than significant.

e. Will (or could) this project result in or increase traffic hazards?

Yes, Not Significant. Vehicular access to the project will be provided at the new South Cowell parking/staging area and the existing North Cowell parking/staging area along the west side of Highway 1. The new parking area will be directly across from the Marsh Produce Stand, which is east of the highway. There is good visibility along this section of Highway 1 as well as a paved shoulder for entering and exiting the parking/staging area, which will minimize traffic hazards. Further, as noted in 5.c above, CalTrans has reviewed the conceptual parking staging area proposal and determined improvements to Highway 1 would be not be warranted.

g. Will (or could) this project generate traffic which will adversely affect the traffic carrying capacity of any roadway?

Yes, Not Significant. Please see response to 5.c above.

6. LAND USE AND GENERAL PLANS

a. Will (or could) this project result in the congregating of more than 50 people on a regular basis?

Yes, Not Significant. The proposed parking/staging area is designed to accommodate 17 cars, while the existing parking/staging area accommodates approximately 17 cars as well. It follows that the number of people able to congregate at the site on a regular basis is expected to be less than 50 people on average.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

File No. PLN 2006-00360

Page 20

- d. Will (or could) this project result in any changes in land use, either on or off the project site?**

Yes, Not Significant. The project is introducing a new public recreational trail into the predominantly agricultural area. The land use of a State park is inherent in the existing trail/recreation easements that exist within the subject properties. The project will introduce public recreational trail access to the site. The project is being constructed to meet an existing recreational demand. The project is not expected to increase demand for other regional facilities. Upon project completion, the new trail will provide access through the site and connect to existing facilities (i.e., Cowell Coastal/Beach access area). The project is not expected to increase demand for other regional facilities or other land uses in the region. Further, this trail is a continuing segment of the California Coastal Trail which is identified in the 2001 San Mateo County Trails Plan. This impact would be less than significant.

- g. Will (or could) this project generate any demands that will cause a public facility or utility to reach or exceed its capacity?**

Yes, Not Significant. Police protection services to the project site are currently provided by the San Mateo County Sheriff Department, with assistance, if necessary, from the City of Half Moon Bay Police Department. Following project implementation, ranger patrol services will be provided by Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District or DPR (State Parks). The City of Half Moon Bay Fire Department provides fire protection services. The California Division of Forestry will provide assistance if needed. The project will not provide any additional water services to the site. Other public improvements are limited to a vault toilet at the parking/staging area, which will be serviced by a contractor under agreement with either Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District or DPR (State Parks). The project is being constructed to meet an existing recreational demand and is not expected to increase demand for other regional facilities. Upon project completion, the new trail will provide access through the site and connect to existing facilities (i.e., Cowell Coastal/Beach access area). The project is not expected to increase demand for other regional facilities or other land uses in the region.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

File No. PLN 2006-00360

Page 21

Given the anticipated limited user capacity of the proposed trail, associated potential impacts to the capacity of these public services will be less than significant.

- p. Will (or could) this project result in creation of or exposure to a potential health hazard?**

Yes, Significant Unless Mitigated. As discussed in 4.d above, the proposed project could expose the visitors to agricultural chemicals. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 9, would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

7. AESTHETIC, CULTURAL, AND HISTORIC

- a. Will (or could) this project be adjacent to a designated Scenic Highway or within a State or County Scenic Corridor?**

Yes, Not Significant. The proposed staging area is within the Highway 1 State Scenic Corridor. However, the project includes the construction of small berms that will screen the parking/staging area from Highway 1. The berms will be vegetated with native plant species and will resemble other berms in the greater project area. In addition, existing native shrubs that screen the view of the parking site from the highway will be preserved. The staging area will be largely screened from the highway, through design of location and landscaped berms. A portion of the trails (leading from the parking/staging area) will be minimally visible from the highway. Further, both parking stalls and the remainder of the parking area and pathways connecting the parking to the public facilities are to be surfaced with compacted base rock which provides a rustic appearance consistent with the natural setting. The remainder of the trails, including the three prefabricated bridges would not be visible.

- d. Will (or could) this project directly or indirectly affect historical or archaeological resources on or near the site?**

Yes, Significant Unless Mitigated. The proposed trail project has the potential to impact cultural resources, prehistoric or historic. A general surface reconnaissance for archaeological resources and historic properties for the project area were prepared by an archaeological consultant. The report concludes that no historic resources were found directly on the trail alignment; however, it is likely the thickly vegetated watercourses were used historically as dumping grounds, and that historic materials were deposited over the bluff edge, but these were not examined. There are, however, two recognized historic resources immediately adjacent to the trail alignment. The Ocean Shore Railroad is a historic resource recognized by the County, as are several of the original stations.

One previously recorded archaeological site and two areas of unrecorded prehistoric archaeological materials were found along the proposed trail alignment. A historic

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

File No. PLN 2006-00360

Page 22

archaeological site is immediately adjacent to a branch of the alignment. The proposed trail construction project could have the potential to adversely affect potentially significant archaeological resources, historic properties, or other cultural resources. Further, the vicinity of Purisima Creek is particularly sensitive for both historic and prehistoric resources.

However, construction of the trail segments is a relatively small-scale project, with minimal grading or excavation proposed. With the exception of the ethnohistoric site, it appears unlikely that construction of the trail will impact significant cultural resources. Given the narrow width but considerable length of the trail corridor(s), monitoring of any grading or excavations for the trail is identified as the most efficient approach to mitigate potential impacts to cultural resources, as outlined in Mitigation Measure 11 below.

Mitigation Measure 11: The applicant and construction contractors shall be prepared to respond appropriately if heretofore undetected archaeological resources are encountered anywhere in the project area. To set up and facilitate both the recommended monitoring and the response procedure required under CEQA, a pre-construction meeting shall be arranged involving responsible project personnel, both on-site and managerial supervisory construction personnel, and the archaeological monitors. The purpose of this meeting will be to familiarize all involved parties with the provisions of this plan. Prior to any site construction, the applicant shall mark the route of the trail in the field and identify all methods and impact areas associated with construction. This should include any and all construction impacts, grading, or excavations, such as for fences along the farmers' fields, waypoints, interpretive signage, retaining walls, etc. After marking, the project archaeologist shall review the alignment and resurvey any areas not previously surveyed or where surface visibility was too poor for adequate initial survey. The archaeologist shall conduct an intensive survey of any trail improvements in the vicinity of the ethnohistoric feature. The project archaeologist shall determine the boundaries of the site by field survey, including clearing of vegetation as needed, and minor subsurface testing to determine whether the site has been spread out by agricultural practices. The site shall be rerecorded to current California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) standards using this new information. If the trail alignment traverses any portion of this site, the archaeologist shall develop an avoidance/minimization plan for review and approval by the County prior to any site construction. The project archaeologist shall determine the boundaries of the prehistoric site and record this feature to current CHRIS standards. Intensive field survey, and possibly minor subsurface testing, shall be conducted to map and characterize the site. If the trail alignment traverses any portion of this site, the archaeologist shall develop an avoidance/minimization plan for review and approval by the County prior to any site construction. At other identified location of prehistoric cultural materials, the lithics scatter shall be resurveyed. If the scatter is found to meet relevant criteria, it shall be recorded as per current CHRIS standards. The location of the Ocean Shore Railroad trestle over

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

File No. PLN 2006-00360

Page 23

Purisima Creek shall be determined, as well as the location of the former Purisima station. This shall necessitate additional survey in and on the banks of the creek corridor, and archival research (the San Mateo County Historical Association archives have extensive materials on the Ocean Shore Railroad). Along the Ocean Shore Railroad railbed and along most of the coastal bluff edge, the project archaeologist shall monitor all grading and excavations. Areas of the trail that are located across areas previously used for agriculture and only require very shallow grading shall be rechecked, and may not be monitored, if so determined by the project archaeologist.

Mitigation Measure 12: The applicant and contractors must be prepared to carry out the requirements of California State law with regard to the discovery of human remains during construction, whether historic or prehistoric. In the event that any human remains are encountered during site disturbance, all ground-disturbing work shall cease immediately and the County coroner shall be notified immediately. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within 24 hours. A qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission, shall recommend subsequent measures for disposition of the remains.

- e. **Will (or could) this project visually intrude into an area having natural scenic qualities?**

Yes, Not Significant. Please see the response to 7.a above.

(6/26/07)

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

County of San Mateo
Planning and Building Department

INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION CHECKLIST
(To Be Completed By Current Planning Section)

I. **BACKGROUND**

Project Title: Cowell Purisima Coastal Trail Project

File No.: PLN 2006-00360

Project Location: The Cowell-Purisima Trail project is located in the southern coastal portion of San Mateo County, south of Half Moon Bay, as depicted on Figure 1 (regional map) and contains two primary properties: the North Cowell Ranch and the Purisima Farms. The northern portion of the project is accessed from the existing parking/staging area and trailhead at Cowell Coastal Access/Cowell Ranch State Beach, as depicted on Figure 2 (project area map). The project area continues southward for approximately 3 miles as a coastal bluff-top trail through North Cowell Ranch property and the Purisima Farms property. The trail then turns eastward, terminating at a new parking/staging area near Highway 1. The project is located in the unincorporated San Mateo County.

Assessor's Parcel Nos.: The entire project site is located on five adjoining parcels that are owned by the State of California, the Giusti Family and one small parcel owned by the Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST). The proposed trail and parking/staging area are proposed on conservation and/or public recreation easement lands that are held by POST and the State Coastal Conservancy.

APN	Property Owner	Property Name
066-170-040	State of California	North Cowell Property
066-170-050	State of California	Recreational Property (actual easement)
066-170-070	Guisti Family, LLC (with conservation and trail easements held by Peninsula Open Space Trust "POST" and SCC)	North Cowell Property
066-170-080	Peninsula Open Space Trust "POST"	North Cowell Property
066-270-010	John and Maureen Giusti (with conservation and trail easements held by Peninsula Open Space Trust "POST" and SCC)	Purisima Farms Property

Applicant/Owners: California State Coastal Conservancy/State of California and Guisti Family, LLC and John and Maureen Giusti and Peninsula Open Space Trust

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

Date Environmental Information Form Submitted: August 24, 2006

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Background: The proposed project is a public trail and small public trail and staging/parking area consisting of 17 informal parking spaces located on the San Mateo County coast, just south of the City of Half Moon Bay. This project would be a segment of the California Coastal Trail, which is a major project of the California Coastal Conservancy, in partnership with other State agencies, and local agencies and organizations, to ultimately complete a continuous trail the length of the California coast. The Coastal Act of 1976 required local jurisdictions to identify an alignment for the California Coastal Trail in their Local Coastal Programs. In 1990, the California Coastal Trail was designated California Millennium Legacy Trail, encouraging Federal agencies to assist in developing it. In 2001, a State resolution declared the Coastal Trail an official State trail and urged the Coastal Commission and Coastal Conservancy to work collaboratively to complete it. In 1987, the Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST) purchased the historic 1,270-acre Cowell Ranch on the San Mateo County coast south of the City of Half Moon Bay. The Cowell Ranch consists of two separate portions: North Cowell Ranch and South Cowell Ranch. POST sold their fee interest for agricultural uses in North Cowell Ranch to the Giusti family and South Cowell Ranch to Bob Marsh and Alan Phillips; however, POST retained conservation and public recreation easement over both properties. Both families who purchased fee interests were aware that conservation and public recreation easements existed.

Between 1989 and 1992, the State Coastal Conservancy (SCC) acquired trail and conservation easements over the Cowell Ranch properties from POST. The SCC also acquired fee title to five parcels in the project area. These parcels, totaling 73 acres, include North Beach, Middle Beach, South Beach, the Doherty parcel and the Purisima Townsite. In 1995, the SCC transferred a portion of its fee and easement interests (including North Beach and trail easement) to the State Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) and provided funding for the construction of the North Cowell Ranch Accessway that was opened to the public in 1996. DPR owns, maintains and operates this accessway. However, SCC retains ownership of a trail easement over this accessway as well as trail and conservation easements over both the North and South Cowell Ranch and fee title to Middle Beach, South Beach, and the historic Purisima Townsite. In addition, POST also holds trail and conservation easements over North and South Cowell Ranches.

In 2002, SCC funded the acquisition by the American Land Conservancy of the trail and conservation easements from POST on Purisima Farms, a 535-acre property located between North and South Cowell Ranches that was owned in fee by POST. Today, the easements are held by POST. The land is owned in underlying fee title by agricultural operators John and Maureen Giusti. Together with the Cowell Ranch trail easements, the Purisima Farms trail easements allow for the proposed construction of a 3-mile section of the California Coastal Trail along the bluff top, in addition to trail connections east to Highway 1. Following completion of the trail construction, SCC will transfer all of its Cowell Ranch fee and easement interests to an appropriate operating entity, such as DPR or the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (MROSD). POST will likely retain its interests over both Cowell Ranch and Purisima Farms.

Project Description: The California State Coastal Conservancy (SCC) proposes to construct the 3-mile segment of the California Coastal Trail. The proposed Cowell Purisima Coastal Trail Project begins at the existing Cowell Coastal Access and extends southward for approximately 3 miles as a coastal bluff-top trail through North Cowell Ranch and the Purisima Farms property, ultimately reaching the north boundary of the South Cowell Ranch property (Figure 2). The trail terminates at a proposed new parking/staging area near Highway 1. The trail will be a pedestrian and bicycle trail that will be set back from the coastal bluff. No beach access will be provided and dogs will not be allowed. The trail will be located within a 25-foot wide easement on the North Cowell Ranch and a 50-foot wide easement on the Purisima Farms property, except that the leg connecting east to the parking/staging area is in a 25-foot wide easement. These features are depicted on Figures 3-14.

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

Project features include an 8-foot wide base rock and/or decomposed granite trail (with 1-foot wide compacted shoulders on each side of the actual 6-foot trail), three prefabricated bridges (to cross two ravines and Purisima Creek), and a small (17-car capacity) parking/staging area. One formal overlook is proposed at the south end of the trail to provide additional coastal views. The project also includes erosion control features, drainage improvements, fencing made of weave/hog wire topped with two strands of barbed wire and reinforced "Peeler Core" posts (near agricultural fields) and access gates. Sections of the trail at Purisima Creek will traverse slopes of up to 40%, which will be accomplished by using a standard recreational trail cross section with switchbacks to meet DPR standards for ADA access.

The Cowell Purisima Coastal Trail will be a multi-use trail serving recreational users. The 3-mile bluff-top trail will provide a coastal experience, yet is sited to keep the trail as far away as possible from the edge of the bluffs due to the sensitivity of a seal colony, hazards presented by the cliffs, to protect the native coastal scrub and riparian habitats and to discourage people from trying to access the beach from the trail. The trail is also designed and located in the attempt to minimize potential conflicts with adjacent agricultural operations.

No access to the beach is provided or allowed in the current project. Beach access is available at the existing Cowell Coastal Access, although the stairs to the beach are currently closed due to wave damage. Seal Rock, just south of North Cowell Beach, is the site of a protected harbor seal rookery. Generally, the beaches along the route are not appropriate for public access due to the seals and other sensitive species such as the snowy plover, the steep and unstable cliffs, hazardous access conditions, and encroaching high tides and waves. The proposed trail improvements will be designed to eliminate existing unauthorized access to the beaches that has occurred along the route, and to mitigate potential impacts of the proposed trail on sensitive resources. There are a number of low, wet areas along the trail route that will require drainage improvements across the trail and potentially upland from the trail. Built-up sections with sub-drains will be constructed in wet areas. A number of locations where the existing ravine edge is eroding will be repaired with rock, as detailed in the plans.

One objective of the trail layout is to keep the trail as far away as possible from the edge of the bluffs due to the sensitivity of the seal colony, the safety hazards presented by the cliffs, to protect the coastal scrub and riparian habitats along the cliffs and ravines, and to discourage people from trying to reach the beach from the trail. The route for the trail skirts the ravines to a point where a trail bridge is feasible, rather than routing trails down into the ravines, or routing the trail around the ravines, which could have resulted in potential impacts to agriculture by location. Portions of the trail on the North Cowell property will be sited, fenced and screened with native vegetation to prevent visibility of and potential impact on the harbor seal colony that frequents the reef and beach below. One formal overlook point is proposed at the south end of the trail, similar to the existing Cowell Coastal Access.

The trail easements were configured and the trail itself sited and designed to minimize use of agricultural land and interference with agricultural operations, in coordination with the existing agricultural operators. The trail will be separated from adjacent agricultural areas by buffer areas that are from 25 feet in width to minimize potential conflicts with existing agricultural operations (including both a physical setback from the trail from the fence and the existing agricultural road on the other side of the fence). The trail will also be separated from the agricultural areas by weave/hog wire agricultural fence barrier 5 feet in height. This same fencing is proposed at the staging area to prevent dogs from entering the adjacent fields or Highway 1. Dogs are not allowed on the trail. Access gates will be provided for patrol, maintenance, and agricultural access. The trail will feature locking pedestrian/bicycle access gates so the adjacent farmers or the trail operator can temporarily close the trail during spraying or other agricultural operations. Further, at two locations along the fencing which runs east/west from the proposed parking/staging area to the bluff top trail within the Purisima Farms property, double boundary fence gates will be included to allow for livestock and equipment passageway across the trail. These gates open inward towards the proposed trail corridor and will allow livestock and equipment a passageway to access land on the southern side of the trail corridor. The inward opening design of the gates also prohibits livestock from accessing the trail corridor. The trailheads will be signed to warn users that agricultural chemicals may be used on the property, that during irrigation trail users may get wet, that there shall be no trespassing onto surrounding lands and that periodic closure of the trail will occur. The trail will be signed to make it clear that continued trail access

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

depends on cooperating with rules to avoid impacts on the agricultural operations, and impacts on natural resources.

The trail will not be fenced on the coastal side, except at several existing informal access points to the beaches and/or overlooks that will need to be closed and restored. Most of the trail route features little, if any, existing vegetation, except at Purisima Creek (supporting riparian scrub), a traverse through a section of coastal terrace prairie and short traverse through coastal scrub. No trees will be cut to construct the trail; however, native and non-native vegetation will be trimmed or removed to construct the trail at Ravines 3, 4/5, and 6, and at Purisima Creek.

This portion of the coast features high, unstable bluffs and cliffs. Most of the route of the trail is relatively level and is currently negotiable on foot or by vehicle. However, there are several long, deep ravines that traverse the project area that support native coastal and riparian vegetation. Prefabricated bridges will be installed at three ravines, including the ravine at Purisima Creek. The proposed bridges, 120 feet, 160 feet, and 60 feet long (respectively), would be prefabricated steel truss structures set on deep concrete pier foundations. The bridges and foundations are designed to extend well beyond and below the potentially unstable ravine slopes to ensure maximum life for the structures. The bridges will be 8 feet wide and rated for use by patrol trucks. Due to the direct coastal exposure, the bridges are proposed to be galvanized steel. To avoid interfering with agricultural facilities and operations near Purisima Creek, the trail is routed down the side of the creek canyon via a series of switchbacks, skirting an agricultural field, and crossing the creek below an existing small agricultural dam and pump station. This portion of the trail would not be accessible for vehicles, but an existing road to the east providing access for the agricultural field and water system could provide access for trail and bridge construction, maintenance, and patrol. The trail easements were configured and the trail itself sited and designed to minimize use of agricultural land and interference with agricultural operations, in coordination with the existing agricultural operators.

Crossing Purisima Creek and additional area requested by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to help protect a harbor seal colony requires small additions/amendments totaling approximately 0.2 acres to the existing trail easement/recreational property. However, a trail easement approximately 1.79 acres extending east behind the agricultural building complex along the north side of Purisima Creek and a public staging area easement near Highway 1 will be abandoned as part of the easement amendment. On the south side of Purisima Creek, on the Purisima Farms property, an existing trail easement extends east along the south side of the creek to Highway 1. This segment is not proposed to be improved at this time or in the near future.

An east-west trail connection to Highway 1 will lead from the bluff top near the trail's southern terminus to a small public staging area along Highway 1. Mirroring the existing North Cowell staging area, this new staging area will be located along the west side of Highway 1, opposite the Marsh Produce Stand. The parking/staging area is designed to accommodate 17 cars and provide a vault toilet. The lot will be screened from Highway 1 by earth berms and native plantings to reduce any potential impacts to coastal views. The existing farm road which is adjacent to the proposed parking area shall remain.

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

II. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Any controversial answers or answers needing clarification are explained on an attached sheet. For source, refer to pages 17 and 18.

	IMPACT					SOURCE
	NO	YES				
		Not Significant	Significant Unless Mitigated	Significant	Cumulative	
1. <u>LAND SUITABILITY AND GEOLOGY</u>						
Will (or could) this project:						
a. Involve a unique landform or biological area, such as beaches, sand dunes, marshes, tidelands, or San Francisco Bay?			X			B,F,O
b. Involve construction on slope of 15% or greater?			X			E,I
c. Be located in an area of soil instability (subsidence, landslide or severe erosion)?			X			Ba&b,D
d. Be located on, or adjacent to a known earthquake fault?			X			Ba&b,D
e. Involve Class I or Class II Agriculture Soils and Class III Soils rated good or very good for artichokes or Brussels sprouts?		X				Bb,M
f. Cause erosion or siltation?			X			M,I
g. Result in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land?		X				A,M
h. Be located within a flood hazard area?	X					G
i. Be located in an area where a high water table may adversely affect land use?	X					D
j. Affect a natural drainage channel or streambed, or watercourse?		X				E

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

	IMPACT					SOURCE
	NO	YES				
		Not Significant	Significant Unless Mitigated	Significant	Cumulative	
2. <u>VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE</u> Will (or could) this project:						
a. Affect federal or state listed rare or endangered species of plant life in the project area?			X			F
b. Involve cutting of heritage or significant trees as defined in the County Heritage Tree and Significant Tree Ordinance?	X					I,A
c. Be adjacent to or include a habitat food source, water source, nesting place or breeding place for a federal or state listed rare or endangered wildlife species?			X			F
d. Significantly affect fish, wildlife, reptiles, or plant life?			X			I
e. Be located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve?	X					E,F,O
f. Infringe on any sensitive habitats?			X			F
g. Involve clearing land that is 5,000 sq. ft. or greater (1,000 sq. ft. within a County Scenic Corridor), that has slopes greater than 20% or that is in a sensitive habitat or buffer zone?			X			I,F,Bb
3. <u>PHYSICAL RESOURCES</u> Will (or could) this project:						
a. Result in the removal of a natural resource for commercial purposes (including rock, sand, gravel, oil, trees, minerals or topsoil)?	X					I

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

	IMPACT					SOURCE
	NO	YES				
		Not Significant	Significant Unless Mitigated	Significant	Cumulative	
b. Involve grading in excess of 150 cubic yards?			X			I
c. Involve lands currently protected under the Williamson Act (agricultural preserve) or an Open Space Easement?		X				I
d. Affect any existing or potential agricultural uses?			X			A,K,M
4. <u>AIR QUALITY, WATER QUALITY, SONIC</u>						
Will (or could) this project:						
a. Generate pollutants (hydrocarbon, thermal odor, dust or smoke particulates, radiation, etc.) that will violate existing standards of air quality on-site or in the surrounding area?	X					I,N,R
b. Involve the burning of any material, including brush, trees and construction materials?	X					I
c. Be expected to result in the generation of noise levels in excess of those currently existing in the area, after construction?	X					Ba,I
d. Involve the application, use or disposal of potentially hazardous materials, including pesticides, herbicides, other toxic substances, or radioactive material?			X			I
e. Be subject to noise levels in excess of levels determined appropriate according to the County Noise Ordinance or other standard?	X					A,Ba,Bb
f. Generate noise levels in excess of levels determined appropriate according to the County Noise Ordinance standard?			X			I

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

	IMPACT					SOURCE
	NO	YES				
		Not Significant	Significant Unless Mitigated	Significant	Cumulative	
g. Generate polluted or increased surface water runoff or affect groundwater resources?			X			I
h. Require installation of a septic tank/leachfield sewage disposal system or require hookup to an existing collection system which is at or over capacity?	X					S
5. <u>TRANSPORTATION</u> Will (or could) this project:						
a. Affect access to commercial establishments, schools, parks, etc.?	X					A,I
b. Cause noticeable increase in pedestrian traffic or a change in pedestrian patterns?		X				A,I
c. Result in noticeable changes in vehicular traffic patterns or volumes (including bicycles)?		X				I
d. Involve the use of off-road vehicles of any kind (such as trail bikes)?		X				I
e. Result in or increase traffic hazards?		X				S
f. Provide for alternative transportation amenities such as bike racks?	X					I
g. Generate traffic which will adversely affect the traffic carrying capacity of any roadway?		X				S

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

	IMPACT					SOURCE
	NO	YES				
		Not Significant	Significant Unless Mitigated	Significant	Cumulative	
6. <u>LAND USE AND GENERAL PLANS</u>						
Will (or could) this project:						
a. Result in the congregating of more than 50 people on a regular basis?		X				I
b. Result in the introduction of activities not currently found within the community?	X					I
c. Employ equipment which could interfere with existing communication and/or defense systems?	X					I
d. Result in any changes in land use, either on or off the project site?		X				I
e. Serve to encourage off-site development of presently undeveloped areas or increase development intensity of already developed areas (examples include the introduction of new or expanded public utilities, new industry, commercial facilities or recreation activities)?	X					I,Q,S
f. Adversely affect the capacity of any public facilities (streets, highways, freeways, public transit, schools, parks, police, fire, hospitals), public utilities (electrical, water and gas supply lines, sewage and storm drain discharge lines, sanitary landfills) or public works serving the site?	X					I,S
g. Generate any demands that will cause a public facility or utility to reach or exceed its capacity?		X				I,S
h. Be adjacent to or within 500 feet of an existing or planned public facility?	X					A

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

	IMPACT					SOURCE
	NO	YES				
		Not Significant	Significant Unless Mitigated	Significant	Cumulative	
i. Create significant amounts of solid waste or litter?	X					I
j. Substantially increase fossil fuel consumption (electricity, oil, natural gas, coal, etc.)?	X					I
k. Require an amendment to or exception from adopted general plans, specific plans, or community policies or goals?	X					B
l. Involve a change of zoning?	X					C
m. Require the relocation of people or businesses?	X					I
n. Reduce the supply of low-income housing?	X					I
o. Result in possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	X					S
p. Result in creation of or exposure to a potential health hazard?			X			S
7. <u>AESTHETIC, CULTURAL AND HISTORIC</u> Will (or could) this project:						
a. Be adjacent to a designated Scenic Highway or within a State or County Scenic Corridor?		X				A,Bb
b. Obstruct scenic views from existing residential areas, public lands, public water body, or roads?	X					A,I
c. Involve the construction of buildings or structures in excess of three stories or 36 feet in height?	X					I

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

	IMPACT					SOURCE
	NO	YES				
		Not Significant	Significant Unless Mitigated	Significant	Cumulative	
d. Directly or indirectly affect historical or archaeological resources on or near the site?			X			H
e. Visually intrude into an area having natural scenic qualities?		X				A,I

III. **RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES.** Check what agency has permit authority or other approval for the project.

AGENCY	YES	NO	TYPE OF APPROVAL
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (CE)	X		Section 404 Permit
State Water Resources Control Board		X	
Regional Water Quality Control Board	X		Water Quality Certification
State Department of Public Health		X	
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)		X	
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)		X	
County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC)		X	
CalTrans	X		Encroachment Permit
Bay Area Air Quality Management District		X	
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	X		Consultation with CE on Federally-Listed Species
Coastal Commission	X		Appeals Board
City		X	
Sewer/Water District:		X	
Other: San Mateo County	X		Coastal Development Permit
California Department of Fish and Game	X		Streambed Alteration Agreement

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

IV. MITIGATION MEASURES

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Mitigation measures have been proposed in project application.	<u>X</u>	<u> </u>
Other mitigation measures are needed.	<u> </u>	<u>X</u>

The following measures are included in the project plans or proposals pursuant to Section 15070(b)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines:

Mitigation Measure 1: All project structures shall meet the requirements and recommendations of the Uniform Building Code, Structural Engineers Association of California, the County Geologist, and the soil and foundation investigation report submitted for the project site. Assumptions and design parameters are subject to approval by the County Geologist.

Mitigation Measure 2: Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit to the Planning Department for review and approval an erosion and drainage control plan which demonstrates how the trail and bridge approaches will be graded and controlled, and the transport and discharge of soil and pollutants from the project site will be minimized, consistent with the recommendations as outlined in the submitted "Engineering Geological Review Proposed Cowell Ranch/Purisima Farms Coastal Trail (Timothy C. Best, CEAG, 2004)." This plan shall also include a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which shall adhere to the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines." The goal of this plan is to prevent sediment and other pollutants from leaving the project site and to protect all exposed earth surfaces from erosive forces including:

- a. Stabilizing all denuded areas and maintaining erosion control measures continuously between October 15 and April 15.
- b. Removing spoils promptly, and avoiding stockpiling of fill materials when rain is forecast. If rain threatens, stockpiled soils and other materials shall be covered with a tarp or other waterproof material.
- c. Storing, handling, and disposing of construction materials and wastes so as to avoid their entry to a local storm drain system or water body.
- d. Avoiding cleaning, fueling or maintaining vehicles on-site, except in an area designated to contain and treat runoff.
- e. When cleaning sediments from streets, driveways and paved areas on construction sites, the applicant shall use dry sweeping methods where possible. If water must be used to flush pavement, collect runoff to settle out sediments and protect any storm drain inlets.
- f. Storm drain inlets shall be protected from sediment-laden runoff to the greatest extent feasible. Storm drain inlet protection devices include sand bag barriers, filter fabric fences, block and gravel filters, and burlap bags filled with drain rock.
- g. Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.
- h. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.
- i. Stockpiles and excavated soils shall be covered with secured tarps or plastic sheeting.

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

The approved erosion and drainage control plan shall be implemented prior to the commencement of construction.

Mitigation Measure 3: To avoid impacts to occurrences of beach strawberry, the project biologist shall identify occurrences of beach strawberry within 10 feet of construction and the applicant shall design trail improvements to avoid impacts to these areas. Temporary protective fencing shall be installed adjacent to occurrences of beach strawberry prior to trail construction, with the protective fencing maintained until trail work is completed.

Mitigation Measure 4: Trail construction should be scheduled during the driest time of year. For trail areas near wetlands, creeks or ravines construction shall be limited to between August 1 and October 15. This would minimize any potential harm to the California red-legged frog and the San Francisco garter snake, if they are present in the project vicinity, because during the dry late summer these species are usually found at sites with permanent water. Prior to construction of the bridge across Purisima Creek and the trail areas within 300 feet of the agricultural ponds, a qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys for California red-legged frogs and San Francisco garter snakes. If these species are observed, the applicant shall consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) prior to proceeding with work. The applicant shall implement all avoidance measures as recommended by the USFWS.

Mitigation Measure 5: All construction shall be scheduled to occur after the end of the usual nesting season for breeding birds and the autumnal gather place or over-wintering for Monarch butterflies. Construction shall occur after July 31 and before April 15 of any given year.

Mitigation Measure 6: To minimize impacts to riparian woodland, coastal terrace prairie and coastal scrub, the project biologist shall identify where these habitats occur within the trail alignment or where they occur within 10 feet of construction. The applicant shall design trail improvements to minimize tree removal within the riparian woodland and select trail alignments within the prairie and scrub that minimize the removal of native vegetation within these habitat types. Temporary, protective fencing shall be installed along the edge of the trail construction area to minimize the footprint of construction, with the protective fencing maintained until trail work is completed. The applicant shall implement erosion control measures following trail construction to avoid deposition of sediment into habitats. At bridge crossings, the applicant shall minimize the removal/limbing of riparian vegetation to the greatest extent feasible during placement of the prefabricated bridges and allow trimmed vegetation to naturally re-grow. Post-construction erosion control seeding shall use native grasses and forbs.

Mitigation Measure 7: To minimize degradation of marine habitats, including harbor seal haul-out areas, implement best management practices for erosion control (see Mitigation Measure 1). Toward the north end of the North Cowell property, above the seal haul-out area the width of the trail corridor shall be increased 10 feet, from 25 feet to 35 feet for a distance of approximately 500 feet.

Mitigation Measure 8: The applicant shall submit a dust control plan to the Planning Department for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit associated with any phase of this proposed project. The plan shall include the following control measures:

- a. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily.
- b. Water or cover stockpiles of debris, soil, sand or other materials that can be blown by the wind.
- c. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two (2) feet of freeboard.
- d. Apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking and staging areas at construction sites. Also, hydroseed or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas.
- e. Sweep daily (preferably with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking and staging areas at construction sites.
- f. Sweep adjacent public streets daily (preferably with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto them.

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

- g. Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.).
- h. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads within the project parcel to 15 mph.

The approved plan shall be implemented for the duration of any grading and construction activities that generate dust and other airborne particles.

Mitigation Measure 9: The applicant, or operating entity of trail, shall post signs at the parking areas and at other appropriate locations along the trail corridor that inform facility users of the adjacent agricultural operations. Signs will warn users that agricultural chemicals may be used on the properties, users may get wet from agricultural irrigation, there will be periodic closures to accommodate specific agricultural operations and that no trespassing onto surrounding lands is permitted. Parking may be prohibited at potentially affected parking areas during periods of pesticide application, if needed. The applicant shall be responsible for posting any parking prohibitions or closure. The applicant, or operating entity of trail, shall enter into an agreement with the owners of the surrounding agricultural lands who may request Farm Bureau representation. The terms of the agreement will specify when and how the parking areas and trail will be closed to allow for pesticide applications and other agricultural operations and that the agreement has the ability to be revised to address potential future changes to agricultural conditions. The applicant shall submit a copy of this written agreement, to include all terms as outlined, to the Planning Department prior to finalizing of any associated permit by the Building Inspection Section. The separating fence at the parking/staging area and at other appropriate locations along the trail corridor shall be constructed of weave/hog wire with two strands of barbed wire added to the top, including Peeler Core posts installed at intervals to serve as reinforcement for the other installed T-bar posts to prevent entrance to the adjacent agricultural fields or Highway 1. A water pump shall be installed to distribute water through a new or existing underground pipe from the existing reservoir located on the South Cowell Ranch property under the trail corridor to its north side at a terminus which allows livestock water access.

Mitigation Measure 10: The applicant and construction contractor(s) shall comply with the following noise abatement measures during project construction:

- a. Contractors shall comply with all relevant provisions of applicable noise policies and ordinances, including Title 4, Chapter 4.88 (Noise Control of the San Mateo County Ordinance Code).
- b. Noise levels produced by construction activities shall not exceed 80-dBA level at any one moment. Construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Monday through Friday, and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays. Construction activities shall be prohibited on Sunday and any national holiday.
- c. “Quieter” models of equipment (such as gas or electric equipment as opposed to diesel-powered equipment) shall be used where technology exists or all construction equipment shall have sound-control devices no less effective than those provided on the original equipment. No equipment shall have unmuffled exhaust.
- d. Loud equipment shall not be staged within 200 feet of noise-sensitive receptors to the greatest extent feasible.
- e. The applicant shall designate a “noise disturbance coordinator” who is responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The noise disturbance coordinator shall determine the source of noise complaints (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and institute reasonable measures to correct the problem. A telephone number for the noise disturbance coordinator and approved construction hours shall be posted at the site on conspicuous signage. The noise disturbance coordinator shall contact and advise adjacent noise-sensitive receptors of the construction schedule.
- f. The use of loud sound signals shall be avoided in favor of light warnings except those required by safety laws for the protection of personnel.

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

- g. Following the commencement of construction and as directed by the County of San Mateo, the contractor shall implement appropriate noise mitigation measures including, but not limited to, changing the location of stationary construction equipment, shutting-off idling equipment, rescheduling construction activity, notifying adjacent residents in advance of construction work, rerouting heavy truck traffic, or installing acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources or construction sites.

Mitigation Measure 11: The applicant and construction contractors shall be prepared to respond appropriately if heretofore undetected archaeological resources are encountered anywhere in the project area. To set up and facilitate both the recommended monitoring and the response procedure required under CEQA, a pre-construction meeting shall be arranged involving responsible project personnel, both on-site and managerial supervisory construction personnel, and the archaeological monitors. The purpose of this meeting will be to familiarize all involved parties with the provisions of this plan. Prior to any site construction, the applicant shall mark the route of the trail in the field and identify all methods and impact areas associated with construction. This should include any and all construction impacts, grading, or excavations, such as for fences along the farmers' fields, waypoints, interpretive signage, retaining walls, etc. After marking, the project archaeologist shall review the alignment and resurvey any areas not previously surveyed or where surface visibility was too poor for adequate initial survey. The archaeologist shall conduct an intensive survey of any trail improvements in the vicinity of the ethnohistoric feature. The project archaeologist shall determine the boundaries of the site by field survey, including clearing of vegetation as needed, and minor subsurface testing to determine whether the site has been spread out by agricultural practices. The site shall be rerecorded to current California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) standards using this new information. If the trail alignment traverses any portion of this site, the archaeologist shall develop an avoidance/minimization plan for review and approval by the County prior to any site construction. The project archaeologist shall determine the boundaries of the prehistoric site and record this feature to current CHRIS standards. Intensive field survey, and possibly minor subsurface testing, shall be conducted to map and characterize the site. If the trail alignment traverses any portion of this site, the archaeologist shall develop an avoidance/minimization plan for review and approval by the County prior to any site construction. At other identified location of prehistoric cultural materials, the lithics scatter shall be resurveyed. If the scatter is found to meet relevant criteria, it shall be recorded as per current CHRIS standards. The location of the Ocean Shore Railroad trestle over Purisima Creek shall be determined, as well as the location of the former Purisima station. This shall necessitate additional survey in and on the banks of the creek corridor, and archival research (the San Mateo County Historical Association archives have extensive materials on the Ocean Shore Railroad). Along the Ocean Shore Railroad railbed and along most of the coastal bluff edge, the project archaeologist shall monitor all grading and excavations. Areas of the trail that are located across areas previously used for agriculture and only require very shallow grading shall be rechecked, and may not be monitored, if so determined by the project archaeologist.

Mitigation Measure 12: The applicant and contractors must be prepared to carry out the requirements of California State law with regard to the discovery of human remains during construction, whether historic or prehistoric. In the event that any human remains are encountered during site disturbance, all ground-disturbing work shall cease immediately and the County coroner shall be notified immediately. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within 24 hours. A qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission, shall recommend subsequent measures for disposition of the remains.

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

V. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Yes	No
1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X
2. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?		X
3. Does the project have possible environmental effects which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?		X
4. Would the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

_____ I find the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared by the Current Planning Section.

 X I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because of the mitigation measures in the discussion have been included as part of the proposed project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

_____ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Date

Neal Martin and Associates

VI. SOURCE LIST

- A. Field Inspection
- B. County General Plan 1986
 - a. General Plan Chapters 1-16
 - b. Local Coastal Program (LCP) (Area Plan)
 - c. Skyline Area General Plan Amendment
 - d. Montara-Moss Beach-El Granada Community Plan
 - e. Emerald Lake Hills Community Plan
- C. County Ordinance Code
- D. Geotechnical Maps
 - 1. USGS Basic Data Contributions
 - a. #43 Landslide Susceptibility
 - b. #44 Active Faults
 - c. #45 High Water Table
 - 2. Geotechnical Hazards Synthesis Maps
- E. USGS Quadrangle Maps, San Mateo County 1970 Series (See F. and H.)
- F. San Mateo County Rare and Endangered Species Maps, or Sensitive Habitats Maps
- G. Flood Insurance Rate Map – National Flood Insurance Program
- H. County Archaeologic Resource Inventory (Prepared by S. Dietz, A.C.R.S.) Procedures for Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties – 36 CFR 800 (See R.)
- I. Project Plans or EIF
- J. Airport Land Use Committee Plans, San Mateo County Airports Plan
- K. Aerial Photography or Real Estate Atlas – REDI
 - 1. Aerial Photographs, 1941, 1953, 1956, 1960, 1963, 1970
 - 2. Aerial Photographs, 1981
 - 3. Coast Aerial Photos/Slides, San Francisco County Line to Año Nuevo Point, 1971
 - 4. Historic Photos, 1928-1937

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

- L. Williamson Act Maps
- M. Soil Survey, San Mateo Area, U.S. Department of Agriculture, May 1961
- N. Air Pollution Isopleth Maps – Bay Area Air Pollution Control District
- O. California Natural Areas Coordinating Council Maps (See F. and H.)
- P. Forest Resources Study (1971)
- Q. Experience with Other Projects of this Size and Nature
- R. Environmental Regulations and Standards:
 - Federal
 - Review Procedures for CDBG Programs 24 CFR Part 58
 - NEPA 24 CFR 1500-1508
 - Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties 36 CFR Part 800
 - National Register of Historic Places
 - Floodplain Management Executive Order 11988
 - Protection of Wetlands Executive Order 11990
 - Endangered and Threatened Species
 - Noise Abatement and Control 24 CFR Part 51B
 - Explosive and Flammable Operations 24 CFR 51C
 - Toxic Chemicals/Radioactive Materials HUD 79-33
 - Airport Clear Zones and APZ 24 CFR 51D
 - State
 - Ambient Air Quality Standards Article 4, Section 1092
 - Noise Insulation Standards
- S. Consultation with Departments and Agencies:
 - a. County Health Department
 - b. City Fire Department
 - c. California Department of Forestry
 - d. Department of Public Works
 - e. Disaster Preparedness Office
 - f. Other

(6/26/07)
FRM00018 table format.doc
(1/22/07)

**Responses to Comments on the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration
PLN 2006-00360 – Cowell Purisima Coastal Trail Project**

I. Introduction

A draft Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared to disclose potential environmental effects of the above project per the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The public review period for this document was June 28, 2007 to July 30, 2007. The draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration conclude that any potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed project can be lessened to a level of insignificance through project revisions, and incorporation of mitigation measures, and that there was no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record, that the project may have a significant effect on the environment.

This Responses to Comments document includes responses to comments on the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration raised during the public review period and contains revisions intended to correct, clarify and amplify the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration. No new substantial environmental impact, no increase in the severity of an impact identified in the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, nor any substantial change in the mitigation contents has surfaced in responding to the comments.

II. List of Commenters

Six written items of correspondence containing comments on the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration were received during the public comment period. Copies of each written item are included as an addendum to this document. Further, although received late and *after* the public review comment period deadline, the County's Agricultural Advisory Committee at their August 13, 2007 meeting discussed comments on the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration. Meeting minutes have been included for Planning Commission reference.

1. Robert Marsh (letter dated July 5, 2007)
2. Ruby Pap, California Coastal Commission (letter dated July 23, 2007)
3. Timothy Sable, CalTrans (letter dated July 26, 2007)
4. Jack Olsen, Farm Bureau (letter dated July 28, 2007)
5. Rex Geitner (letter dated July 30, 2007)
6. Ron Sturgeon (letter dated July 30, 2007)
7. Agricultural Advisory Committee Meeting, minutes from August 13, 2007

III. Master Responses to Comments on the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration

This section contains master responses to all comments and questions that were raised – some of which were raised repeatedly in more than one of the received items of correspondence.

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

- Request that the Agricultural Advisory Committee or Agricultural Commissioner participate directly in developing the agreement between the applicant/operating entity of the trail and the agricultural operator as detailed within Mitigation Measure 9. The agreement is to include specifications as to when and how the parking areas and trail will be closed to allow for agricultural chemical applications and other agricultural operations. Also requested, that the agreement can be revised to address potential future changes to agricultural conditions, and that this agreement should be recorded against property title and run with the land.

Response: Upon review of the bi-laws and purpose of the Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC) and Agricultural Commissioner by County Counsel, there does not appear to be a basis for the AAC or the Agricultural Commissioner to be a party to the agreement. The agreement itself is between the agricultural landowner and farm operator and the trail operator. This agreement is a contract, and the parties to a contract are those who agree to do something they are not already obligated to do in return for getting something they are not already entitled to get; this case does not involve the AAC nor the Agricultural Commissioner. The existing language within Mitigation Measure 9 allows the agricultural operator, at his/her discretion, to request representation from the San Mateo County Farm Bureau during the development of this agreement. Further, it is determined that mitigation measures are not ordinarily recorded on property title in San Mateo County.

- Request that the agreement between the applicant/operating entity of the trail and the agricultural landowner/operator as detailed within Mitigation Measure 9 be completed in draft form prior to Planning Commission action on the project.

Response: Draft Mitigation Measure 9 provides specifications as to the topics and items this agreement must include, while actual implementation of the functional details of these terms are to be worked out by the parties to the agreement following a decision on the project. Further, should the project be approved, actual construction may not begin immediately. However, in order to address these comments as presented, draft Mitigation Measure 9 has been enhanced to require that this agreement be finalized prior to the opening of the trail. This language enhancement is included in Section IV, “Staff Initiated Changes and Additions to the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration” below.

- Clarification of the Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN) for the northern most “North Cowell” property. The draft Mitigated Negative Declaration lists this APN as 066-170-070, owned in fee by the Giusti Family, LLC, while Figure 2 – Cowell Purisima Coastal Trail Map lists this APN as 066-081-070. Further clarification was requested on who owns the conservation and trail easements on APN 066-270-010, “Purisima Farms” property, stated as both the Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST) and State Coastal Conservancy owned in fee by John and Maureen Giusti within the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration. Further request on clarification of the ownership for APN 066-170-040.

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

Response: The APN, describing the northern most “North Cowell” property owned by the Giusti Family, LLC, is correct as detailed in the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and incorrect on Figure 2 – Cowell Purisima Coastal Trail Map.

The conservation and trail easements on APN 066-270-010, “Purisima Farms” property, are held solely by the Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST), not the State Coastal Conservancy. This correction is included in Section IV, “Staff Initiated Changes and Additions to the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration” below.

The draft Mitigated Negative Declaration lists the State of California as the property owner of APN 066-170-040; this information is correct per information obtained from the San Mateo County Assessor’s Office.

- Request to replace the word “pesticide” with the words “agricultural chemicals” within the Answers to Questions, Mitigation Monitoring Plan and Negative Declaration.

Response: This is included in Section IV, “Staff Initiated Changes and Additions to the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration” below.

- The exclusion of dogs should be included as a mitigation measure.

Response: The exclusion of dogs is part of the project description, it is not a mitigation measure. Making it a mitigation measure does not strengthen its outcome. A mitigation is an amendment to the original project description requested by the local planning authority in order to make a Negative Declaration in lieu of an EIR. Thus, it is not necessary to add a mitigation excluding dogs as that has already happened voluntarily in the project description.

- Request that the applicant/operating entity of the trail consult with the agricultural operators to assure that conflicts are minimized during the trail construction phase.

Response: Although not a determined environmental impact, a recommended condition within the draft conditions of approval requires the applicant to work with the agricultural operator in developing a construction staging plan.

- Request for the creation of a task force between County staff and other interested individuals (including, but not limited to, the Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC) and San Mateo County Farm Bureau) to look at bigger picture issues and guidelines related to future public recreation access on existing or potential agricultural lands.

Response: Although not specific to the environmental evaluation of this project, County Planning staff and the Community Development Director are researching the matter and intend to report back at a future AAC meeting.

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

- Since the project applicant, the State Coastal Conservancy, neither owns fee or easements on the Purisima Farms properties, the project is subject to all zoning regulations.

Response: County Counsel has concluded the State Coastal Conservancy is exempted by California Government Code Sections 53090 and 53091 from local zoning regulations when applying for a project in furtherance of its statutory mandate for coastal access ways. The fact that the trail runs across private properties is not dispositive, since Section 53091 immunity is linked to the “public purposes” of the State agency, and the issue is whether the development is for a public or private purpose. As the nature of the project is to provide public recreation, it appears the entire project is subject to the same exemption notwithstanding the private ownership of some of the fee estates.

- Question was raised as to why the two smaller Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APNs 066-170-040 and 066-170-080) located on the North Cowell property are included in the project description. Question as to why the existing easements are being abandoned and why they were not assessed as an alternative location for the parking/staging area.

Response: These parcels contain portions of the existing recreation/conservation easements proposed to be abandoned as part of the project, thus were included in the project property description. The applicant worked directly with the agricultural operator on determining the most appropriate, proposed parking lot location. The current location was chosen as it allowed existing recreation/conservation easements which currently run through the existing farm center operation to be abandoned, as preferred by the agricultural operator, and was closest to the trail terminus.

- Request that an Environmental Impact Report should be prepared for the project.

Response: An Initial Study was prepared to determine whether the project may have a significant effect on the environment and identified measures that mitigate project impacts to a less than significant level, thus the decision was made to prepare a Mitigated Negative Declaration. The existence of controversy over the effects of a project does not require preparation of an EIR if there is no substantial evidence in the record that the project may have a significant environmental effect. The question of whether the mitigation measures are sufficient to determine that the project will not have a significant impact on the environment is within the Planning Commission’s discretion.

- Sufficiency of fencing to keep users off of the beach.

Response: As stated in the project description, no public beach access is proposed to be allowed and fencing is to be installed along the western boundary of the proposed trail corridor areas which abut the coastal bluff line. Further, three existing dilapidated stairways leading to the beach are proposed to be removed from the North Cowell property. The presence of a sensitive habitat (i.e., an existing seal haul out area) would further preclude public beach access.

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

- Concern that existing language within Mitigation Measure 9 stating, “*The separating fence at the parking/staging area and at other appropriate locations along the trail corridor...*” is not sufficient and should state fence should be installed at all locations along trail to separate agricultural land.

Response: As detailed within the “Answers to Questions,” the intent of this mitigation language is to address potential impacts of the project related to surrounding agricultural lands and operations. Several lineal segments of the proposed trail do not directly abut these lands and operations. However, to provide clarification as to where this fencing is to serve as mitigation, that statement “...*and other appropriate locations abutting agricultural lands and operations along the trail corridor...*” would enhance this mitigation. This is included in Section IV, “Staff Initiated Changes and Additions to the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration” below.

- Request that the existing covenants and restrictions for the North Cowell property be incorporated into the language of Mitigation Measure 9, if not completely substituted.

Response: A pre-existing property right is not a mitigation measure by the project applicant to minimize impact of the project on the environment. Referring to the easements in the mitigation measures would not have any significant legal effect on their permanence or enforceability. As stated in the response to comment that an EIR should be prepared for the project, completion of the Initial Study identified potentially significant effects on the environment, but revisions in the project plans or agreed to by the applicant before the proposed Negative Declaration and Initial Study were released for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effect on the environment would occur, and that there is no substantial evidence in light of the whole record before the public agency that the project, as revised, may have a significant effect on the environment. The question of whether the mitigation measures are sufficient to determine that the project will not have a significant impact on the environment is within the Planning Commission’s discretion.

- Existing language in Mitigation Measure 9 which provides a watering system for cattle may not be sufficiently adequate for livestock herd.

Response: The language within Mitigation Measure 9 pertaining to the watering system currently reads: “*A water pump shall be installed to distribute water through a new or existing underground pipe from the existing reservoir located on the South Cowell Ranch property under trail corridor to its north side at a terminus which allows livestock water access.*” As detailed within the “Mitigated Negative Declaration – Answers to Questions,” the identified environmental impact associated with this mitigation is that an impact to existing agricultural uses (i.e., livestock) may not have access to their water source as a result of the project. In order to enhance this mitigation for clarity, language should be added to Mitigation Measure 9 detailing a water holding system that will make water constantly available for livestock. This is included in Section IV, “Staff Initiated Changes and Additions to the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration” below.

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

- The 24-foot wide double boundary gates within the trail corridor which will allow for livestock and equipment passageway may not be wide enough in the future should equipment needs change.

Response: As detailed within the “Mitigated Negative Declaration – Answers to Questions,” the identified environmental impact associated with this mitigation is that an impact to existing agricultural uses (i.e., livestock and equipment passageway) may be caused as a result of the project. Existing language within the mitigation allows for future changes in the agreement between the agricultural operator and the applicant, should changes in agricultural conditions warrant, which could include enlarging the width of the double boundary fence gate. However, in order to enhance this mitigation for clarity, language is included within Mitigation Measure 9 requiring the agreement between the applicant/operating entity of the trail and the agricultural operator to provide flexibility specifically for making the gates wider in the future if warranted. This is included in Section IV, “Staff Initiated Changes and Additions to the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration” below.

- Request of documentation from California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) that the existing farm road is allowed to remain and any prior documentation that determined that the existing drainage channel which runs parallel to the southern property boundary line of the Purisima Farms property was, per CDFG definition, a “sensitive habitat.”

Response: A written response from Dave Johnson at the CDFG stating that the farm road may remain was forwarded to the commenter and a hard copy is available in the project file for public review. There is no written documentation that the existing drainage channel which runs parallel to the southern property boundary line of the Purisima Farms property was, per CDFG definition, a “sensitive habitat” – this was a verbal determination by CDFG.

- Concern that existing parking lot for Cowell Beach users is not large enough to accommodate existing users during peak usage and that vehicles of users of this proposed trail may impact surrounding properties.

Response: No beach access is proposed with the current project. Given the relative short distance of the trail, historic analysis of other State parks similar in size and use, the proposed parking area was determined to meet the demand of the project users. Further, should the location and size of the proposed parking area be increased, additional impacts to the surrounding agricultural lands may result which was not a project goal of the applicant. CalTrans did review the proposed project scope and parking lot area and layout and determined that no upgrades or revisions to either Highway 1/Cabrillo Highway or the parking area entry were necessary or warranted from a traffic and circulation standpoint. Any parking prohibition and/or signage along Highway 1 are subject to review and approval by CalTrans. Although not an identified environmental impact, a draft recommended condition of approval within the Coastal Development Permit allows the Planning Commission to re-review the project should significant negative parking or circulation impacts occur.

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

- There was question as to who is responsible for the maintenance of boundary fence between agricultural fields and the trail, as well as the opening and closing of the trail.

Response: The applicant/operating entity of the project.

- There was question as to who is responsible for construction, operation and maintenance of watering system.

Response: The applicant for construction and the agricultural operator for maintenance and operation.

- There was question as to who is responsible for the actions of recreational users and vehicles associated with the project both on and off project site. There was a request for further clarification of the enforcement and responsibilities of trail rules and regulations as it related to both the applicant and the agricultural operator.

Response: The responsibility of vehicle enforcement will depend on the location of the vehicle as would be standard with any vehicle violations within the County. Any vehicles (potentially) parked illegally within the CalTrans right-of-way are the responsibility of CalTrans and their operating law enforcement. Any vehicles (potentially) parked illegally on private property are the responsibility of the private property owner. The responsibility of vehicle enforcement within the project parking area is the responsibility of the trail operator. State public parks have established procedure as to how vehicle enforcement within State public parks is conducted. If vehicles are abandoned in the parking area after the park closure hours, citations are issued. Vehicles are not locked into the parking area. However, the trail is patrolled by a park ranger or enforcement officer of the park at the closure hour in order to clear off any existing users.

County Counsel has determined enforcement would really depend upon the specific facts of the situation and it would all turn on the particular kind of land condition that resulted in the injury, as well as the nature of the trespasser's use of the land. A definitive answer would strictly depend upon the specific circumstances of the situation. For example, a public agency may be legally responsible for the use of public property when there is a dangerous condition, but that rule does not apply when there is a specific immunity, and there are specific immunities for trails and recreational facilities that could be applicable. Also, a public agency would not be responsible for intentional acts or willful misconduct by the public. California Civil Code Section 846 provides certain immunities to private landowners who give permission for their own land to be used for recreational purposes; however, the specifics of the situation would need to be analyzed for accurate determination. There is no single result that can be predicted, thus County Counsel cannot offer an exhaustive opinion about the various rules that would apply to adjacent private landowners. Adjacent landowners should therefore be advised by their own counsel about their personal liability and what they can do to protect themselves and others.

- There was question as to who is responsible for trail closure and sign posting.

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

Response: The applicant/operating entity.

- As the historic rate of sea cliff retreat is estimated at 0-4 inches a year, it was suggested that a condition be included requiring the trail location to be relocated inland as the bluff retreats for ensured consistency with the Local Coastal Program.

Response: Currently, Recommended Condition #1 of the draft Coastal Development Permit states, *“This approval applies only to the proposal, documents and plans described in this report as “Cowell Purisima Trail Project” and as submitted to and approved by the Planning Commission on August 8, 2007. Minor revisions or modifications to this project in the future may be made subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Director. Any changes determined to be substantive may require re-review by the Planning Commission.”* Any changes to the trail location would be subject to review and approval by the Community Development Director under this condition. A significant trail relocation may require further detailed review to determine continued consistency with the LCP, depending what, if any, other impacts may also result.

- Existing language within Mitigation Measure 4 which states, *“Trail construction should be scheduled during the driest time of year. For trail areas near wetlands, creeks or ravines, construction shall be limited to between August 1 and October 15. This would minimize any potential harm to California red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake, if they are present in the project vicinity, because during the dry late summer, these species are usually found at sites with permanent water. Prior to construction of the bridge across Purisima Creek and the trail areas within 300 feet of the agricultural ponds, a qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys for California red-legged frogs and San Francisco garter snakes. If these species are observed, the applicant shall consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) prior to proceeding with work. The applicant shall implement all avoidance measures as recommended by the USFWS.”* Concern was expressed that pre-construction surveys may not be sufficient and that a qualified biologist should be present on-site at all times with the authority to stop work.

Response: As detailed in the “Mitigated Negative Declaration – Answers to Questions” Section 2.c, potential habitat for the San Francisco garter snake and California red-legged frog may occur in the greater project area; however, no actual habitat nor species were identified. The proposed trail alignment, where adjacent to agricultural ponds that could be occupied by California red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake, is located along an existing farm road that is compacted from use and provides little or no cover habitat, and therefore the project is not expected to result in any permanent loss of habitat for these two federally listed species. Further, this mitigation prohibits trail construction during specific times of year and near areas where these species, and/or habitat they might transition through, could be impacted, as documented by the project biologist. While an on-site biologist present at all times during construction may not be necessary, pre-construction surveys conducted no sooner than 15 days prior to the construction within the identified areas would enhance this mitigation. This is included in Section IV, “Staff Initiated Changes and Additions to the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration” below. Thus, it is determined

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

that the proposed mitigation language, as enhanced, appears sufficient in addressing this potential impact.

- CalTrans presented a series of conditions that they would like to be included within the project documents related to securing necessary permits for work conducted within their right-of-way. CalTrans also requested that construction documents be forwarded for their review and that their staff archaeologist should be notified if archaeological resources are found within their right-of-way.

Response: Within the recommended draft conditions of approval is a condition requiring any work within CalTrans right-of-way to be subject to an encroachment permit and any other approvals as determined necessary, as well as requiring final drainage plans to be submitted to CalTrans as well. Mitigation Measure 11 includes a list of required mitigation activities should the project directly or indirectly affects historical or archaeological resources upon discovery. This mitigation measure was enhanced to include appropriate CalTrans notification should historical or archaeological resources be discovered within CalTrans right-of-way. This is included in Section IV, “Staff Initiated Changes and Additions to the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration” below.

IV. Staff Initiated Changes and Additions to the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration

The following Items A-H below detail staff initiated changes and additions to the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration as a result of the received public comment.

- A. Mitigation Measure 9 contained within the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, Initial Study, Answers to Questions and Mitigation Monitoring Plan is revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure 9: The applicant, or operating entity of the trail, shall post signs at the parking areas and at other appropriate locations along the trail corridor that inform facility users of the adjacent agricultural operations. Signs will warn users that agricultural chemicals may be used on the properties, users may get wet from agricultural irrigation, there will be periodic closures to accommodate specific agricultural operations and that no trespassing onto surrounding lands is permitted. Parking may be prohibited at potentially affected parking areas during periods of agricultural chemical application, if needed. The applicant or trail operating entity shall be responsible for posting any parking prohibitions or closure. The applicant, or operating entity of the trail, shall enter into an agreement with the owners and farm operators of the surrounding agricultural lands, who may request Farm Bureau representation. The terms of the agreement will specify when and how the parking areas and trail will be closed to allow for agricultural chemical applications and other agricultural operations, and that the agreement has the ability to be revised to address potential future changes to agricultural conditions **and the need for wider double boundary fence gates**. The applicant shall submit a copy of this written agreement, to include all terms as outlined, to the Planning Department prior to finalizing of any associated permit by the Building Inspection Section and **prior to the opening of the public recreation trail**. The separating fence at the parking/staging area and at other

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

appropriate locations **abutting agricultural lands and/or operations** along the trail corridor shall be constructed of weave/hog wire with two strands of barbed wire added to the top, including Peeler Core posts installed at intervals to serve as reinforcement for the other installed T-bar posts to prevent entrance to the adjacent agricultural fields or Highway 1. A water pump shall be installed to distribute water through a new or existing underground pipe from the existing reservoir located on the South Cowell Ranch property under the trail corridor to its north side at a terminus which **shall include a water holding system** allowing livestock **continual** water access.

- B. Figure 2 “Cowell Purisima Trail Map” which is an attachment to the Mitigated Negative Declaration is revised as follows:

APN: 066-081 **170**-070, 272.752 AC

- C. Assessor’s Parcel Number table on page 1 of the Initial Study is revised as follows:

APN	Property Owner	Property Name
066-170-040	State of California	North Cowell Property
066-170-050	State of California	Recreational Property (actual easement)
066-170-070	Giusti Family, LLC (with conservation and trail easements held by Peninsula Open Space Trust “POST” and SCC)	North Cowell Property
066-170-080	Peninsula Open Space Trust “POST”	North Cowell Property
066-270-010	John and Maureen Giusti (with conservation and trail easements held by Peninsula Open Space Trust “POST” and SCC)	Purisima Farms Property

- D. Page 12 of the Answers to Questions, to be revised as follows:

- 3.d. Will (or could) this project affect any existing or potential agricultural uses?

Yes, Significant Unless Mitigated. The proposed trail corridor is located primarily within existing trail/recreation easements contained within each of the subject parcels. The proposed trail improvements will impact approximately 4.2 acres of existing agricultural land. However, the trail corridor was designed to include three ravine bridges, as opposed to continuing within the boundaries of the existing trail/recreation easements in an attempt to minimize impacts to over 2 acres of agricultural land.

Implementation of the project and recreational use of the trail may affect existing agricultural uses if trail use precludes normal agricultural operations on the adjacent agricultural lands (i.e., ~~pesticide~~ **agricultural chemical** application or other agricultural operations). The plan, however, includes

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

measures to ensure that recreational uses do not impede continued agricultural operations on the properties. Such measures include posting permanent signs at the parking/staging area and at other appropriate locations along the trail that inform trail users of the adjacent agricultural operations. Signs will warn users that ~~pesticides~~ **agricultural chemicals** may be used on the properties, users may get wet from agricultural irrigation, and there will be periodic closures to accommodate specific agricultural operations and that trespassing onto surrounding lands is prohibited. The plan also specifies that there will be an agreement between the applicant (or managing entity of the trail), property owners of the surrounding agricultural lands and a Farm Bureau representative, which will specify when and how trails will be closed to allow for ~~pesticide~~ **agricultural chemical** applications and other agricultural operations. Further, this agreement will allow for term revisions should future agricultural conditions potentially change.

E. Page 15 of the Answers to Questions to be revised as follows:

- 4.d. Will (or could) this project involve the application, use or disposal of potentially hazardous materials, including pesticides, herbicides, other toxic substances, or radioactive material?

Yes, Significant Unless Mitigated. Small amounts of hazardous materials (oil, gasoline, etc.) may be temporarily located on-site during the new project construction activities. This routine occurrence would be subject to existing local, State, and Federal regulations and controls, and thus would not be expected to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. The operation and use of the proposed project would not involve the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, other than small quantities of hazardous materials, such as paints, cleaners, and disinfectants, normally used in routine maintenance and cleaning functions. These commercial products are labeled to inform users of potential risks and to instruct them in appropriate handling and disposal procedures. Most of the materials are consumed through use, resulting in relatively little waste. For these reasons, hazardous materials use by the project would not pose any substantial public health or safety hazards related to hazardous materials. The adjacent agricultural operations store pesticides and other chemicals within their barns and other facilities, which are not located in close proximity to the proposed project. As discussed in Response 3.d, above, agricultural chemicals applied to the adjacent agricultural field could adversely affect users of the trail and improvements. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 9 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level which requires measures to post and temporarily close the trail prior to and after ~~pesticide~~ **agricultural chemical** applications.

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

F. Page 5 of the Mitigation Monitoring Plan to be revised as follows:

Implementation Measures of Mitigation 9

- The applicant, or operating entity of the trail, shall enter into an agreement with the owners of the surrounding agricultural lands, who may request Farm Bureau representation, that will specify when and how the parking areas and trail will be closed to allow for ~~pesticide~~ **agricultural chemical** applications and other agricultural operations, and that the agreement has the ability to be revised to address potential future changes to agricultural conditions.
- Parking may be prohibited at potentially affected parking areas during periods of ~~pesticide~~ **agricultural chemical** application, if needed.

G. Mitigation Measure 4 contained within the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, Initial Study, Answers to Questions and Mitigation Monitoring Plan is revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure 4: Trail construction should be scheduled during the driest time of year. For trail areas near wetlands, creeks or ravines construction shall be limited to between August 1 and October 15. This would minimize any potential harm to the California red-legged frog and the San Francisco garter snake, if they are present in the project vicinity, because during the dry late summer these species are usually found at sites with permanent water. Prior to construction of the bridge across Purisima Creek and the trail areas within 300 feet of the agricultural ponds, a qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys for California red-legged frogs and San Francisco garter snakes. **Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted no sooner than 15 days prior to the construction.** If these species are observed, the applicant shall consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) prior to proceeding with work. The applicant shall implement all avoidance measures as recommended by the USFWS.

H. Mitigation Measure 11 contained within the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, Initial Study, Answers to Questions and Mitigation Monitoring Plan is revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure 11: The applicant and construction contractors shall be prepared to respond appropriately if heretofore undetected archaeological resources are encountered anywhere in the project area. To set up and facilitate both the recommended monitoring and the response procedure required under CEQA, a pre-construction meeting shall be arranged involving responsible project personnel, both on-site and managerial supervisory construction personnel, and the archaeological monitors. The purpose of this meeting will be to familiarize all involved parties with the provisions of this plan. Prior to any site construction, the applicant shall mark the route of the trail in the field and identify all methods and impact areas associated with construction. This should include any and all construction impacts, grading, or excavations, such as for fences along the farmers' fields, waypoints, interpretive signage, retaining walls, etc. After marking, the project archaeologist shall review the

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

alignment and resurvey any areas not previously surveyed or where surface visibility was too poor for adequate initial survey. The archaeologist shall conduct an intensive survey of any trail improvements in the vicinity of the ethnohistoric feature. The project archaeologist shall determine the boundaries of the site by field survey, including clearing of vegetation as needed, and minor subsurface testing to determine whether the site has been spread out by agricultural practices. The site shall be rerecorded to current California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) standards using this new information. If the trail alignment traverses any portion of this site, the archaeologist shall develop an avoidance/minimization plan for review and approval by the County prior to any site construction. The project archaeologist shall determine the boundaries of the prehistoric site and record this feature to current CHRIS standards. Intensive field survey, and possibly minor subsurface testing, shall be conducted to map and characterize the site. If the trail alignment traverses any portion of this site, the archaeologist shall develop an avoidance/minimization plan for review and approval by the County prior to any site construction. At other identified location of prehistoric cultural materials, the lithics scatter shall be resurveyed. If the scatter is found to meet relevant criteria, it shall be recorded as per current CHRIS standards. The location of the Ocean Shore Railroad trestle over Purisima Creek shall be determined, as well as the location of the former Purisima station. This shall necessitate additional survey in and on the banks of the creek corridor, and archival research (the San Mateo County Historical Association archives have extensive materials on the Ocean Shore Railroad). Along the Ocean Shore Railroad railbed and along most of the coastal bluff edge, the project archaeologist shall monitor all grading and excavations. Areas of the trail that are located across areas previously used for agriculture and only require very shallow grading shall be rechecked, and may not be monitored, if so determined by the project archaeologist.

Areas of project construction with CalTrans right-of-way in which archaeological resources are inadvertently discovered shall require construction to cease within 50 feet of the find, and the CalTrans Cultural Resources Studies Office, District 4 shall be immediately contacted at 510/286-5618.

LAA:NMA:fc – NMAR1012_WFU.DOC

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

FOR STAFF USE:

Publish Advertisement in:

Date: June 25, 2007

<u> x </u>	San Mateo County Times
<u> </u>	Independent Newspaper Group
<u> </u>	Palo Alto Times/Tribune
<u> x </u>	Half Moon Bay Review
<u> </u>	Other

NOTICE OF NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Notice is hereby given that the San Mateo County Planning and Building Department has determined that the following project will not have a significant effect on the environment and has, therefore, prepared a Negative Declaration:

FILE NO.: PLN 2006-00360

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The California State Coastal Conservancy (SCC) proposes to construct a 3-mile segment of the California Coastal Trail beginning at the existing Cowell Coastal Access and extending southward as a coastal bluff-top trail through the North Cowell Ranch and Purisima Farms property, ultimately reaching the north boundary of the South Cowell Ranch property. The trail terminates at a new parking/staging area near Cabrillo Highway 1. The trail will be a pedestrian and bicycle trail that will be located back from the coastal bluff within a 25-foot wide existing recreation easement on the North Cowell Ranch and a 50-foot wide recreation easement on the Purisima Farms property. A small portion of additional trail easement area approximately 0.2 acres is proposed to accommodate the proposed trail corridor. Additional areas of existing trail easement are not proposed to be utilized.

PROJECT LOCATION: The Cowell-Purisima Trail project is located in the southern coastal portion of San Mateo County, south of Half Moon Bay and contains two primary properties: the North Cowell Ranch and the Purisima Farms. The northern portion of the project is accessed from the existing parking/staging area and trailhead at Cowell Coastal Access/Cowell Ranch State Beach. The project area continues southward for approximately 3 miles as a coastal bluff-top trail through North Cowell Ranch property and the Purisima Farms property. The trail then turns eastward, terminating at a new parking/staging area near Highway 1. The project is located in the unincorporated San Mateo County.

REVIEW PERIOD: June 28, 2007 to July 30, 2007

DATE AND TIME OF PUBLIC HEARING: August 8, 2007; 9:00 a.m. (tentative)

PLACE OF PUBLIC HEARING: Board of Supervisors Chambers, Hall of Justice and Records, 400 County Center, Redwood City, California

PROJECT PLANNER: Stephanie Bertollo-Davis, Neal Martin Associates, 650/200-7180

PROJECT MANAGER: Lisa Aozasa, Senior Planner, San Mateo County Planning Department, 650/363-4852

The project file is located at the office of the County Planning and Building Department, 455 County Center, Second Floor, Redwood City, California. For further information on the date and time of public hearings for this project, contact the project planner.

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Monitoring Program for Cowell Purisima Coastal Trail Project October, 2007

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Responsibility	Implementation	Verification	Program Implementation and Milestones
The project is located in area of potential soil instability, involves construction on a slope greater than 15%, is near a known earthquake fault and involves grading .	Mitigation Measure 1: All project structures shall meet the requirements and recommendations of the Uniform Building Code, Structural Engineers Association of California, the County Geologist, and the soil and foundation investigation report submitted for the project site. Assumptions and design parameters are subject to approval by the County Geologist.	California Coastal Conservancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit construction documents to County Geologist and Building Inspection Section for review. 	Review of design of all structures by County Geologist and Building Inspection Section.	Prior to initiation of construction of each structure, project applicant shall obtain approval of County Geologist and Building Inspection Section.
The project may cause erosion or siltation. The project could generate polluted or increased surface water runoff.	<p>Mitigation Measure 2: Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit to the Planning Department for review and approval an erosion and drainage control plan which demonstrates how the trail and bridge approaches will be graded and controlled, and the transport and discharge of soil and pollutants from the project site will be minimized, consistent with the recommendations as outlined in the submitted "Engineering Geological Review Proposed Cowell Ranch/Purisima Farms Coastal Trail (Timothy C. Best, CEAG, 2004)." This plan shall also include a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which shall adhere to the San Mateo Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program "General Construction and Site Supervision Guidelines." The goal of this plan is to prevent sediment and other pollutants from leaving the project site and to protect all exposed earth surfaces from erosive forces including:</p> <p>a. Stabilizing all denuded areas and maintaining erosion control measures continuously between October 15 and April 15.</p>	California Coastal Conservancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stabilize all denuded areas and maintain erosion control measures continuously between October 15 and April 15. Remove spoils promptly, and avoid stockpiling fill materials when rain is forecast. If rain threatens, stockpiled soils and other materials shall be covered with a tarp or other waterproof material. Store, handle, and dispose of construction materials and wastes so as to avoid their entry to a local storm drain system or water body. Avoid cleaning, fueling or maintaining vehicles on-site, except in an area designated to contain and treat runoff. When cleaning sediments from streets, driveways and paved areas on construction sites, the applicant shall use dry sweeping methods where possible. If water must be used to flush pavement, collect runoff to settle out sediments and protect any storm drain inlets. Storm drain inlets shall be protected from sediment-laden runoff to the greatest extent feasible. Storm drain inlet protection devices include sand bag barriers, filter fabric fences, block and gravel filters, and burlap bags filled with drain rock. Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways. 	Review of erosion and drainage control plan by County Planning Department. Periodic monitoring of the construction operations and compliance to mitigation measure; record findings in project file.	<p>Project applicant shall include these measures in construction documents.</p> <p>The approved erosion and drainage control plan shall be implemented prior to the commencement of construction.</p> <p>California Coastal Conservancy staff shall monitor construction activities by the contractor.</p> <p>County Inspectors shall verify implementation measures during project inspections.</p>

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Responsibility	Implementation	Verification	Program Implementation and Milestones
	<p>b. Removing spoils promptly, and avoiding stockpiling of fill materials when rain is forecast. If rain threatens, stockpiled soils and other materials shall be covered with a tarp or other waterproof material.</p> <p>c. Storing, handling, and disposing of construction materials and wastes so as to avoid their entry to a local storm drain system or water body.</p> <p>d. Avoiding cleaning, fueling or maintaining vehicles on-site, except in an area designated to contain and treat runoff.</p> <p>e. When cleaning sediments from streets, driveways and paved areas on construction sites, the applicant shall use dry sweeping methods where possible. If water must be used to flush pavement, collect runoff to settle out sediments and protect any storm drain inlets.</p> <p>f. Storm drain inlets shall be protected from sediment-laden runoff to the greatest extent feasible. Storm drain inlet protection devices include sand bag barriers, filter fabric fences, block and gravel filters, and burlap bags filled with drain rock.</p> <p>g. Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.</p> <p>h. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.</p> <p>i. Stockpiles and excavated soils shall be covered with secured tarps or plastic sheeting.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible. ▪ Stockpiles and excavated soils shall be covered with secured tarps or plastic sheeting. 		

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Responsibility	Implementation	Verification	Program Implementation and Milestones
The project may affect a unique plant species and impact plant life.	Mitigation Measure 3: To avoid impacts to occurrences of beach strawberry, the project biologist shall identify occurrences of beach strawberry within 10 feet of construction and develop a plan to include measures identified in the Implementation column.	California Coastal Conservancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trail improvements designed to avoid impacts to these areas. Temporary protective fencing shall be installed adjacent to occurrences of beach strawberry prior to trail construction. Temporary protective fencing maintained until trail work is completed. 	Monitoring construction operations and applicant's compliance to mitigation measure; record finding in project file.	<p>California Coastal Conservancy staff shall monitor construction activities by the contractor.</p> <p>County Inspectors shall verify implementation measures during project inspections.</p>
The project may impact habitat of plant and wildlife species and could involve hazardous materials.	Mitigation Measure 4: Trail construction should be scheduled during the driest time of year. For trail areas near wetlands, creeks or ravines, construction shall be limited to between August 1 and October 15. This would minimize any potential harm to California red-legged frog and San Francisco garter snake, if they are present in the project vicinity, because during the dry late summer these species are usually found at sites with permanent water. Prior to construction of the bridge across Purisima Creek and the trail areas within 300 feet of the agricultural ponds, a qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys for California red-legged frogs and San Francisco garter snakes. If these species are observed, measures identified in the Implementation column shall be met.	California Coastal Conservancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) prior to proceeding with work. Implementation of all avoidance measures as recommended by the USFWS. 	Monitoring construction operations and applicant's compliance to mitigation measure; record finding in project file.	<p>California Coastal Conservancy staff shall monitor construction activities by the contractor.</p> <p>County Inspectors shall verify implementation measures during project inspections.</p>
The project could impact nesting birds.	Mitigation Measure 5: The project shall avoid impacts to nesting birds during construction by including measures identified in the Implementation column.	California Coastal Conservancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All construction shall be scheduled to occur after the end of the usual nesting season for breeding birds and the autumnal gather place or overwintering for Monarch butterflies. Construction shall occur after July 31 and before April 15 of any given year. 	Monitoring construction operations and applicant's compliance to mitigation measure; record finding in project file.	<p>California Coastal Conservancy staff shall monitor construction activities by the contractor.</p> <p>County Inspectors shall verify implementation measures during project inspections.</p>
The project may infringe on sensitive habitats and affect fish, wildlife or plant life.	Mitigation Measure 6: The project shall minimize impacts to riparian woodland, coastal terrace prairie and coastal scrub.	California Coastal Conservancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project biologist shall identify where these habitats occur within the trail alignment or where they occur within 10 feet of construction. The applicant shall design trail improvements to minimize tree removal within the riparian woodland and select trail alignments within the prairie and scrub that minimize the removal of native vegetation within these habitat types. 	Monitoring construction operations and applicant's compliance to mitigation measure; record finding in project file.	<p>California Coastal Conservancy staff shall monitor construction activities by the contractor.</p> <p>County Inspectors shall verify implementation measures during project inspections.</p>

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Responsibility	Implementation	Verification	Program Implementation and Milestones
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Temporary, protective fencing shall be installed along the edge of the trail construction area to minimize the footprint of construction, with the protective fencing maintained until trail work is completed. The applicant shall implement erosion control measures following trail construction to avoid deposition of sediment into habitats. At bridge crossings, the applicant shall minimize the removal/limbing of riparian vegetation to the greatest extent feasible during placement of the prefabricated bridges and allow trimmed vegetation to naturally re-grow. Post-construction erosion control seeding shall use native grasses and forbs. 		
The project may infringe on sensitive habitat.	Mitigation Measure 7: The project shall minimize degradation of marine habitats, including harbor seal haul-out areas.	California Coastal Conservancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement Best Management Practices for erosion control (See Mitigation Measure 1). Toward the north end of the North Cowell Property, above the seal haul-out area the width of the trail corridor shall be increased 10 feet, from 25 feet to 35 feet for a distance of approximately 500 feet. 	Review of design of all structures by Planning Department; Monitoring construction operations and applicant's compliance to mitigation measure; record finding in project file.	<p>Project applicant shall include these measures in construction documents.</p> <p>California Coastal Conservancy staff shall monitor construction activities by applicant's contractor.</p> <p>County Inspectors shall verify implementation measures during project inspections.</p>
The project will involve grading in excess of 150 cubic yards.	Mitigation Measure 8: The applicant shall submit a dust control plan to the Planning Department for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. The plan shall include the control measures identified in the Implementation column.	California Coastal Conservancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water all active construction areas at least twice daily. Water or cover stockpiles of debris, soil, sand or other materials that can be blown by the wind. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two (2) feet of freeboard. Apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking and staging areas at construction sites. Also, hydroseed or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas. Sweep daily (preferably with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking and staging areas at construction sites. 	Monitoring construction operations and applicant's compliance to mitigation measure; record finding in project file.	<p>Prior to the issuance of a building permit associated with any phase of this proposed project, the dust control plan shall be approved by the Planning Department.</p> <p>The approved plan shall be implemented for the duration of any grading and construction activities that generate dust and other airborne particles.</p> <p>California Coastal Conservancy staff shall monitor construction activities by applicant's contractor.</p>

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Responsibility	Implementation	Verification	Program Implementation and Milestones
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sweep adjacent public streets daily (preferably with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto them. Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.). Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads within the project parcel to 15 mph. 		County Inspectors shall verify implementation measures during project inspections.
The project could affect existing agricultural uses. The project could involve the application, use or disposal of potentially hazardous materials. The project would result in the creation of or exposure to a potential health hazard.	Mitigation Measure 9: The applicant or operating entity of trail, shall post signs at the parking areas and at other appropriate locations along the trail corridor that inform facility users of the adjacent agricultural operations. . The applicant shall enter into an agreement with the owners of the surrounding agricultural lands and representative from the Farm Bureau to the Planning Department prior to finalizing of any associated permit by the Building Inspection Section as specified in the Implementation column.	California Coastal Conservancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signs shall warn users that agricultural chemicals may be used on the properties, users may get wet from agricultural irrigation, there will be periodic closures to accommodate specific agricultural operations and that no trespassing onto surrounding lands is allowed. The applicant, or operating entity of the trail, shall enter into an agreement with the owners of the surrounding agricultural lands and Farm Bureau representative that will specify when and how the parking areas and trail will be closed to allow for pesticide applications and other agricultural operations and that the agreement has the ability to be revised to address potential future changes to agricultural conditions. Parking may be prohibited at potentially affected parking areas during periods of pesticide application, if needed. The applicant, or operating entity of the trail shall be responsible for posting any parking prohibitions or closure. The separating fence at the parking/staging area and at other appropriate locations along the trail corridor shall be constructed of weave/hog wire with two strands of barbed wire added to the top, including Peeler Core posts installed at intervals to serve as reinforcement for the other installed T-bar posts to prevent entrance to the adjacent agricultural fields or Highway 1. A water pump shall be installed to distribute water thru a new or existing underground pipe from the existing reservoir located on the South Cowell Ranch property under trail corridor to its north side at a terminus which allows livestock water access. 	Monitoring applicant's compliance to mitigation measure during project operation; record finding in project file.	<p><u>Agreement with Agricultural Operators:</u> The applicant shall submit a copy of this written agreement to the Planning Department prior to finalizing of any associated permit by the Building Department.</p> <p><u>Posting of Signage and Fencing:</u> California Coastal Conservancy staff shall monitor signage, posting of any parking prohibitions, and fencing requirements on an ongoing basis during project operation.</p> <p>California Coastal Conservancy staff shall monitor construction activities by applicant's contractor.</p> <p>County Inspectors shall verify implementation measures during project inspections.</p>

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Responsibility	Implementation	Verification	Program Implementation and Milestones
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The separating fence at the parking/staging area shall include a two-foot high hog wire panel at the base to prevent dogs from entering the adjacent fields or Highway 1. If on-leash dogs are determined to be allowed on the trail, this type of fencing, or a design substantially similar in capacity, shall be required for all portions of the fence which directly abuts adjacent agricultural land. 		
The project could generate noise levels in excess of levels determined appropriate according to the County Noise Ordinance standard.	Mitigation Measure 10: During project construction, the applicant and construction contractor(s) shall comply with the noise abatement measures identified in the Implementation column.	California Coastal Conservancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contractors shall comply with all relevant provisions of applicable noise policies and ordinances, including Title 4, Chapter 4.88 Noise Control of the San Mateo County Ordinance Code. Noise levels produced by construction activities shall not exceed 80 dBA level at any one moment. Construction activities shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Monday through Friday and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays. Construction activities shall be prohibited on Sunday and any national holiday. "Quieter" models of equipment, (such as gas or electric equipment as opposed to diesel-powered equipment) shall be used where technology exists or all construction equipment shall have sound-control devices no less effective than those provided on the original equipment. No equipment shall have unmuffled exhaust. Loud equipment shall not be staged within 200 feet of noise-sensitive receptors to the greatest extent feasible. The applicant shall designate a "noise disturbance coordinator" who is responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The noise disturbance coordinator shall determine the source of noise complaints (e.g. starting too early, bad muffler, etc) and institute reasonable measures to correct the problem. A telephone number for the noise disturbance coordinator and approved construction hours shall be posted at the site on conspicuous signage. The noise disturbance coordinator shall contact and advise adjacent noise- 	Monitoring construction operations and applicant's compliance to mitigation measure; record finding in project file.	<p>California Coastal Conservancy staff shall monitor construction activities by applicant's contractor.</p> <p>County Inspectors shall verify implementation measures during project inspections.</p>

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Responsibility	Implementation	Verification	Program Implementation and Milestones
			sensitive receptors of the construction schedule.		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The use of loud sound signals shall be avoided in favor of light warnings except those required by safety laws for the protection of personnel. ▪ Following the commencement of constructed and as directed by the County of San Mateo, the contractor shall implement appropriate noise mitigation measures including, but not limited to, changing the location of stationary construction equipment, shutting off idling equipment, rescheduling construction activity, notifying adjacent residents in advance of construction work, re-routing heavy truck traffic, or installing acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources or construction sites. 		
The project could directly or indirectly affect archeological resources at or near the site.	Mitigation Measure 11: The applicant and construction contractors shall be prepared to respond appropriately if heretofore undetected archaeological resources are encountered anywhere in the project area and shall be prepared to carry out the requirements of California State law with regards to the discovery of human remains during construction, whether historic or prehistoric.	California Coastal Conservancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To set up and facilitate both the recommended monitoring and the response procedure required under CEQA, a pre-construction meeting shall be arranged involving responsible project personnel, both onsite and managerial supervisory construction personnel, and the archaeological monitors. The purpose of this meeting will be to familiarize all involved parties with the provisions of this plan. ▪ Prior to any site construction, the applicant shall mark the route of the trail in the field and identify all methods and impact areas associated with construction, including any and all construction impacts, grading, or excavations, such as for fences along the farmers' fields, waypoints, interpretive signage, retaining walls, etc. ▪ After marking the route of the trail, the project archeologist shall review the alignment and resurvey any areas not previously surveyed or where surface visibility was too poor for adequate initial survey. ▪ The archeologist shall conduct an intensive survey of any trail improvements in the vicinity of the ethnohistoric feature. 	Monitoring construction operations and applicant's compliance to mitigation measure; record finding in project file.	<p>The California Coastal Conservancy shall submit a written Archaeological Monitoring Agreement for review and approval by the Planning Department during construction grading activities.</p> <p>California State Department of Parks and Recreation staff shall monitor construction activities by applicant's contractor.</p>

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Responsibility	Implementation	Verification	Program Implementation and Milestones
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The project archaeologist shall determine the boundaries of the site by field survey, including clearing of vegetation as needed, and minor subsurface testing to determine whether the site has been spread out by agricultural practices. ▪ The site shall be re-recorded to current California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) standards using this new information. ▪ If the trail alignment traverses any portion of this site, the archeologist shall develop an avoidance/minimization plan for review and approval by the County prior to any site construction. ▪ The project archaeologist shall determine the boundaries of the prehistoric site and record this feature to current CHRIS standards. 		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Intensive field survey, and possibly minor subsurface testing, shall be conducted to map and characterize the site. ▪ If the trail alignment traverses any portion of this site, the archeologist shall develop an avoidance/minimization plan for review and approval by the County prior to any site construction. ▪ At other identified location of prehistoric cultural materials, the lithics scatter shall be resurveyed. ▪ If the scatter is found to meet relevant criteria, it shall be recorded as per current CHRIS standards. ▪ The location of the Ocean Shore Railroad (OSRR) trestle over Purisima Creek shall be determined, as well as the location of the former Purisima station. This shall necessitate additional survey in and on the banks of the creek corridor, and archival research (the San Mateo County Historical Association archives has extensive materials on the Ocean Shore RR). ▪ Along the OSRR railbed and along most of the coastal bluff edge, the project archeologist shall monitor all grading and excavations. 		

Exhibit 5: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring Program

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Responsibility	Implementation	Verification	Program Implementation and Milestones
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas of the trail that are located across areas previously used for agriculture and only require very shallow grading shall be rechecked, and may not be monitored, if so determined by the project archeologist. 		
The project could directly or indirectly affect archeological resources at or near the site.	Mitigation Measure 12: The applicant and contractors shall be prepared to carry out the requirements of California State law with regards to the discovery of human remains during construction, whether historic or prehistoric.	California Coastal Conservancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the event that any human remains are encountered during site disturbance, all ground-disturbing work shall cease immediately and the County coroner shall be notified immediately. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within 24 hours. A qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission, shall recommend subsequent measures for disposition of the remains. 	Monitoring construction operations and applicant's compliance to mitigation measure; record finding in project file.	California Coastal Conservancy staff shall monitor construction activities by applicant's contractor.

(06/26/07)